How Shakespeare Got His *Tempest*: Another "Just So" Story

Roger Stritmatter and Lynne Kositsky

Abstract

The one-hundred-year tradition identifying William Strachey's *True Reportory* (*TR*)* as a paramount *Tempest* source and influence is rooted in a history of critical error and omission and contradicted by a host of stubborn facts about *TR's* genesis and textuality. Alden Vaughan's recent critique of our *Review of English Studies* article perpetuates this tradition of error, failing to provide a substantive critique of the theory that *TR*, as subsequently published in 1625, was not completed until at least 1612, far too late for it to have been a *Tempest* source. The recent discovery in Bermuda of an early draft of the Strachey manuscript, lacking in plausible ties to *The Tempest*, compounds the crisis of the orthodox paradigm by supplying a textual exemplar confirming our argument: That if any version of Strachey's text returned on the July 1610 Gates' voyage, it would have been a much abbreviated draft lacking the literary and rhetorical flourishes of the published document. Neither Vaughan nor the sources on which he depends (Kathman, Cawley, etc.) have established evidence "from sign" of *TR's* influence on *Tempest*; a far more persuasive source of Shakespeare's New World imagery and ethos is Richard Eden's 1555 translation of Iberian travel narratives, *Decades of the Newe Worlde*.

* Abbreviations used in this article: *TR=True Reportory*; *TD=True Declaration of the Estate of the Colony in Virgini*a (S122265); *B*=Hume manuscript of early *TR* draft; Discovery=Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas* (S109240); *PP=Purchas His Pilgrimes* (S111862); *H of T= History of Travail in Virginia*.

In a recent *Shakespeare Quarterly* article, "William Strachey's 'True Reportory' and Shakespeare: a Closer Look at the Evidence,"[1] Alden Vaughan critiques our 2007 *Review of English Studies* (*RES*) article,[2] which questioned the reliability of the longstanding claim that Strachey's manuscript, not published until 1625, was transmitted to England and accessible to Shakespeare in 1610. Regrettably, Vaughan's "Just So" story of how Shakespeare got his tale does not live up to the subtitle's promise. Instead of inviting a closer look at the evidence, Vaughan's case for the traditional identification of Strachey's manuscript[3] as a paramount *Tempest* source and inspiration tries to make a weak argument appear not merely persuasive, but inevitable; in the process it perpetuates longstanding but dubious assumptions, misconstrues factual evidence, attributes to us arguments we did not make, and promotes an inaccurate view of *Tempest* critical history. The efficacy of Vaughan's critique, moreover, depends substantially on the reader's acceptance of highly prejudicial language designed to compensate for the inadequacies of more rational discourse;[4] his version of the intellectual history of the case for Strachey's influence on *The Tempest,* as expressed in *SQ*, is effectively Manichean: there are heroes such as Edmund Malone[5] and Morton Luce, who advocate the "standard thesis," and there are "people determined to find a date earlier than 1604 for the *Tempest*'s composition,"[6] who are "in denial of the obvious."[7]

This characterization misrepresents the basis for doubting the "standard thesis," and constitutes an oversimplification of the history of the debate, substituting an *ad hominem,* which challenges our motives rather than responding to our arguments, for a reasoned defense of the traditional view. Before examining Vaughan's case in detail, let us therefore consider the logical relationship between theories of influence and theories of chronology, which is by no means as simple as Vaughan implies. Of course, if advocates of the "standard thesis" could conclusively prove Shakespeare's dependence on Strachey's text, it would require the play to have been written in or after fall, 1610, but *the reverse does not hold*. While the argument that Shakespeare did not depend on Strachey *opens the door to* theories of earlier composition, too closely connecting Strachey with theories of *Tempest* chronology only promotes confusion and misunderstanding. Sources can only establish a *terminus a quo* (a date "after which"), which is often much earlier than the actual composition date, never a *terminus ad quem* ("before which"). It is thus entirely possible – although not our own view – that Shakespeare did not make use of Strachey but wrote *Tempest* in 1608, 1609, or even 1611.

Vaughan's emphasis on chronology as the determining factor in doubts about Strachey's influence also misrepresents the history of skepticism. Contemporary skeptics of the Strachey theory include David Lindley[8] and Andrew Gurr,[9] neither of whom, to our knowledge, has ever advocated a Tempest composition date any earlier than 1608-9. Elze[10] – writing, it should be noted, fifty years before the

"Oxfordians" came on the scene – advocated a date as early as 1604, Hunter (1839),[11] on the other hand, was at least as concerned with geography as with chronology; as an early proponent of the view that Shakespeare's *Tempest* landscape was more Mediterranean than Atlantic, he not only found Malone's assertions connecting the play to Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas* and to *True Declaration*, as did many subsequent scholars, implausible, but also considered them a geographical red herring. Nor was Kenneth Muir engaging in chronological revisionism when he expressed the conviction – without ever wholly repudiating a link between *The Tempest* and the Gates shipwreck – that "the extent of the verbal echoes of [the Bermuda] pamphlets has been exaggerated."[12]

Moreover, such contemporary critics as Penny McCarthy have suggested earlier *Tempest* dates without even considering the Strachey question. McCarthy, who found evidence that *The Tempest* was staged as early as 1599, cogently identifies the Achilles heel of the orthodox chronological framework when she notes that "the whole edifice of what is here for short-hand called 'the consensus' [of the chronology of the plays] rests dangerously on the assumption that date of composition must be close to date of first performance/publication/ mention" but that "there is no reason why Shakespeare's plays should have been originally written close to the first [documentary] record of their existence."[13] McCarthy's argument exemplifies the well-understood principle, applicable to all the historical sciences, that surviving evidence for innovation (including the composition dates of plays) always constitutes a *terminus ad quem*, not an *a quo*. This results from the simple fact that evidence degrades over time;[14] where it is scarce or fragile (as are early modern theatrical records, for example), the earliest exemplars in a series are likely to degrade or be lost more readily than later ones.[15] A method that neglects this principle will typically produce a reconstruction that postdates to a greater or lesser extent the actual occurrence of a given innovation.

Most important, as we shall see, Vaughan's response presents as factual narrative scenarios that are wholly without evidentiary basis. His notion of *Tempest* critical history, for instance, is flawed by confusion even over the definition of such basic terms as the "standard thesis" he is defending. On one hand, he explicitly defines this as "the assumption" that has "long persisted" that "somehow Shakespeare read Strachey's manuscript (or a copy) and that [*Tempest*] reveals its influence."[16] Surprisingly, given this definition, he asserts that the two "principal authors"[17] of the thesis are Edmund Malone (1808) and Arden editor Morton Luce (1901). As any reader of our *RES* article is aware, however, this is incorrect. Although Malone did (as Vaughan subsequently qualifies) posit that the 1609 *Sea Venture* shipwreck, generally construed, was "the determining evidence for the *Tempest*'s date of origin,"[18] he was *not* an advocate of the standard thesis as defined by Vaughan. On the contrary, Malone argued primarily for the influence of another Bermuda pamphlet, Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas* (1610). A reader of Vaughan's essay will even be surprised to learn that although Malone in fact lists fourteen texts related to the Virginia exploration and Bermuda wreck as possible *Tempest* sources, Strachey's *True Reportory*, the existence of which he was apparently

entirely unaware, is not one of them.[19]

To notice that Vaughan not only begins his case by identifying Malone as an advocate of the "standard thesis," but concludes by unequivocally stating that "Malone and Luce were right,"[20] is to be made aware that Vaughan's entire argument hinges on a fundamental misconception. Although Malone and Luce shared the belief that the Gates/Somers wreck influenced Shakespeare in some way, they held quite different views of how the incident exercised this alleged influence; indeed, Luce is highly critical of Malone's errors and omissions, and would no doubt be surprised to find himself lumped in with Malone as one of the two founders of the modern "standard thesis."[21] Having begun by conflating the distinct positions of Malone and Luce, and then sidelining Furness, Elze, and Hunter as irrelevant to *Tempest* critical history, Vaughan, perhaps not surprisingly, omits the role of these later critics in shaping the "standard thesis"; instead he constructs a monolithic orthodoxy that never existed, ignoring the process by which the orthodox paradigm was transformed over decades of revision, during which one implausible theory – originally Malone's – was brought into doubt, silently rejected, and then replaced with an alternative, all with very little explicit acknowledgement of how the theory had evolved. By inaccurately elevating Malone and Luce as co-architects of a now indisputable "standard thesis," Vaughan perpetuates the forgetfulness on which the traditional view is predicated, and on which it depends to retain an aura of authority.

Unlike Malone, Luce *was* an advocate of the Strachey theory. Although he was apparently the first of several to attempt a detailed exposition of the supposed linguistic and thematic links between Strachey's document and *The Tempest*,[22] he appears to have obtained the idea of *TR*'s significance from W.H. Furness' Variorum.[23] A realistic critical history therefore cannot overlook the implications of Furness' vital role in the development of the "standard thesis," or conceal his relevance behind such nebulous adjectives as "ambivalent"; as we have already noted, Furness apparently turned to *TR* as a possible source only because Elze and Hunter had undermined Malone's chief nominee, Jourdain, as a plausible candidate for *Tempest* influence.[24]

Critical scrutiny of Luce's methods, moreover, reveals the frailty of any modern theory that relies on his authority. Luce deals with the influence of the Bermuda pamphlets in two places. His introduction cursorily identifies "three pamphlets" of the Bermuda adventure that "must have left a deep impression throughout England" by carrying "news of the storm" that had already "reached England before the end of 1609."[25] The three "pamphlets" are Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas*, which Luce dates 13 October, 1610; *True Declaration* (*TD*), dated "autumn of 1610"; and a third, untitled, "of earlier date" but "by William Strachey, who had lived in the 'Black friers,' wrote poetry, and very possibly had talk with Shakespeare."[26] Luce's claim that Strachey's text – which he inaccurately terms a "pamphlet" – is "of earlier date" than *Discovery* and *TD* is based on an unambiguous misconception. Unlike the two other dates given by Luce, the July 15, 1610, date for *TR* is not, as we discussed, a date of registration or publication;[27] on the contrary, it is a date *internal to the document*, subsequently copied by editor Purchas[28] and perpetuated over many decades of academic error as a reliable *terminus ad quem*. The

relevance of this distinction becomes apparent when we notice that Luce fails to mention the availability of a comparable internal date for *Discovery,* which breaks off its narrative on June 19, when Sir George Somers departed to fetch supplies from Bermuda. This date, *three-and-one-half weeks before TR*'s July 15 date, wholly invalidates Luce's argument that *TR* antedates *Discovery*.

This is an inauspicious beginning for an analysis now credited with establishing the "standard thesis" of Strachey's influence. In the first place, Luce applies a misleading and inconsistent bibliographical standard. The first two documents are named and dated. The third, only later identified as "Strachey's Letter or Reportory,"[29] is nameless but is said – incorrectly, as we have seen – to be earlier than the other two, and to be a "pamphlet." Close reading of Appendix 1 confirms that Luce's analysis of Strachey is badly flawed. Here Luce reprints bibliographical particulars of no fewer than eighteen possibly relevant Virginia or Bermuda publications, dated 1608-13.[30] All but one – the manuscript of Lord de La Warre's dispatch of 7 July, 1610[31] – are published documents, including, of course, *TR*. And all of them, *except for Strachey's document*, are accurately listed under their dates of publication (or registration). Only Strachey is listed using the July 15, 1610, internal date originating towards the end of the manuscript (reproduced in the 1625 editorial apparatus, and treated by modern scholars at least since Luce as the composition date). No other item is designated by a date other than its actual publication or registration date.[32]

But surely Luce, somewhere in his Arden edition, makes clear that Strachey's document was not published until 1625? Surprisingly – and suggestively –he does not. Luce does admit that "apart from Purchas, which of course is *too late for The Tempest*, I cannot trace any printing or publication of this letter."[33] The admission reveals the extent to which Luce struggled to resolve the apparent contradiction between the publication date of Strachey's manuscript and his desire to read it as Shakespeare's source. But a reader will search Luce's book in vain – through a dozen references to the name Purchas – for any mention of the pertinent but troubling fact that the text which Luce would make the foundation of his case for *Tempest* influence is not just "too late" – it was not published until *fourteen years after* the November 1, 1611, first recorded production of Shakespeare's play. Luce is consequently forced to conclude, without ever fully acknowledging the contradiction between the facts and his scenario, that Shakespeare must have read the document in manuscript.[34] And without embarking on the kind of elaborate narratives later devised by Gayley and Vaughan to explain Shakespeare's access to an unpublished manuscript, Luce lays the foundation for further "inquiry" not only by noting that "the original document is said to have been one of the manuscripts preserved by Hakluyt,"[35] but – most significantly – introducing Strachey as an associate of the Blackfriars theatre and undoubted confidante of the bard's.

The Concluding Excerpt from *TD:* Strachey, Hakluyt, or Purchas?

Purchas' *TR* concludes with an extended excerpt (Folios 1756-1758) from *True Declaration* (registered Nov. 8, 1610), introduced with a first person transition acknowledging that *TD* has already been published. *TR* editor Louis B. Wright's suggestion was that the first person pronoun in the transitional phrase, "I have here inserted this their publicke testimony," belongs to Purchas. We questioned whether the interpolation should be attributed to Purchas or to Strachey himself, and examined a number of problems associated with either option. Vaughan, on the other hand, is committed to a third possibility, by far the least likely, that Hakluyt, whose estate apparently transmitted the document to Purchas in 1616, is responsible for the *TD* addendum. To support the hypothesis of Hakluyt as the amender, Vaughan places great emphasis on two formal characteristics of Purchas' text. Neither, however, is as conclusive as he insists.

In the Table of Contents to *Purchas His Pilgrimes*, Purchas explains that narratives modified by Hakluyt are identified by an appended "H"; those modified by Purchas himself are identified with a "P"; those to which both men made significant contributions are labeled with both initials. To Vaughan, the fact that there is no editorial "P" attached to the apparatus for Strachey's narrative therefore constitutes unambiguous proof that Purchas cannot be the amender: for Purchas "to substantially alter a text he received from Hakluyt without adding a 'P' in the table of contents would have compromised his stated rules and denied a collaboration of which he would have been proud."[36]

Unfortunately, Vaughan's *presumption* of Purchas' editorial consistency[37] is contradicted by the demonstrable facts of Purchas' practice:[38] PP contains several clear examples of Purchas doing exactly what Vaughan insists he would not do. Neither H nor P, for example, is prefixed to Purchas' Table of Contents entry for Sir Arthur Gorges' *A Large Relation of the Said Island Voyage* title.[39] In a side note to the text, Purchas declares, "I have not added a word of mine but the title and marginal notes."[40] And yet, in his introductory sentence to the text, Purchas states: "and for the more plaine manifesting of the message, I have thought it not amisse, here *to insert the true Copie of the instructions verbatim* that our general sent by Master Robert Knolles into England ...."[41]

Likewise, in his *The Historie of Lopez Vaza Portugall*, another section of *PP* with neither H or P appended, Purchas states in a side note: "Part of this discourse was published by M. Hak, out of a written copy containing the whole. I have *added and inserted those things which I thought fit*, leaving out such as before have been by others delivered."[42]

Vaughan also argues that Hakluyt is the responsible editor because the concluding *TD* extract is "printed in italics, so readers cannot miss [its] separate identity";[43] by "separate identity," he means that Strachey cannot be responsible for the quote. He will later go on to chastise scholars who, because they depend on modern editions, fail to "understand the signals included in early modern printing."[44] In this case, however, it would appear that Vaughan himself has not carefully

consulted the original, or, if he has, is ignoring the implications of the volume's actual typographical conventions. Italics in fact occur throughout *TR* to denote material that is being quoted, apparently by Strachey himself, from external sources; the italics of the concluding excerpt from *TD* therefore do not prove Vaughan's point that the amender cannot be Strachey, let alone that he must be Hakluyt.

Examination of Hakluyt's and Purchas' published works, on the other hand, reveals that the language of the transitional phrase – "I have here inserted" –directly controverts Vaughan's theory. Using word search functions, Lynne Kositsky and Tom Reedy[45] determined that Hakluyt very rarely uses the word "inserted" in his transitional introductions;[46] he strongly prefers the word "annexed." However, when appending parts of another work, Purchas frequently uses "inserted."[47]

Finally, Vaughan's confidence that Hakluyt is responsible for the emendations to Strachey's text, including the final *TD* excerpt, is called into question by existing Hakluyt scholarship, which unambiguously supports a contrary view. Hakluyt scholar George Bruner Parks, for example, comments extensively on the differences in style and temperament between the two editors:

> What Hakluyt did not [characteristically] do was to cut down the narrative itself. Purchas, his successor, did and was praised for it by our eighteenth century critic. The difference between the two men and their methods is radical. Purchas, using in large part Hakluyt's own collections, was to write a history of travel and so to satisfy the amateur reader....Wherever possible he used the work of others, weaving it into his own frame. But Hakluyt was not writing a history. He was compiling archives of history and was obliged to print his documents complete.[48]

And

> What [Purchas] added in his own way was unimportant; but what he later subtracted was disastrous. 'Tedious' was a favorite editorial word of Purchas; and, when a manuscript was 'tedious' he abridged it or even omitted it entirely.[49]

Having ignored these problems, including Parks' analysis of the sharp contrast in style between the two editors (which clearly supports the inference of Purchas, not Hakluyt, as the editor), Vaughan later goes so far as to claim that it is "obvious" that the *TD* extract was added by Hakluyt "in the fall of 1610."[50] But there is scant basis for claiming that this scenario is real, let alone asserting that it is "obvious"; even if Vaughan could establish, as he does not, that the excerpt was added by Hakluyt, it would not prove *when* Hakluyt received the document or when the alteration was made. Indeed, throughout his analysis "obvious" appears frequently, clearly meaning "without substantive evidence"; Vaughan's *a priori* scenario is not constructed from factual evidence, but instead serves the rhetorical function of conveniently *requiring* the manuscript to have been returned to London on the

summer 1610 crossing, in time for Shakespeare to consult it before the November 1, 1611, *Tempest* production.

Although Vaughan characterizes our method on this point as one of "peremptorily rejecting"[51] Wright's theory, ironically he engages in his own doubtfully credible critique of Wright's position. Here, for the first time, he insists on the manuscript's July 15, 1610, "date of completion"[52] as an established fact, but does not take up the issue of how the editor would have known this and does not supply an accurate description of the date's textual origin. Instead, following in the tradition set down by Luce for avoiding uncomfortable subjects, he perpetuates Luce's unexamined myth, ignoring the original context of the date's genesis from within the manuscript. In this original context, it is, however, clear that the date refers to an event *happening within the narrative and that therefore by definition it antedates the document's actual completion*.[53] By forcing readers to accept this date as a true date of completion, Strachey's original editor, followed by scholars such as Luce and Vaughan, has magically translated a date that in its original context was only a *terminus a quo* into a *terminus ad quem*.

In view of these manifold problems, one may safely conclude that Vaughan's theory that Hakluyt appended the concluding *TD* excerpt to *TR* is the least likely of the three possible explanations. The comparative linguistic and circumstantial evidence tends to support Wright's initial theory of Purchas as the amender, but there remains a case to be made for Strachey aa – contrary to Vaughan's implication – there are several other instances of particular authors appending materials to their contributions to *PP*,[54] and the portions of *TR* that Vaughan himself attributes to Strachey frequently use italics to mark Strachey's own interjected material.

The Appending of *TD* to *TR*

Why wouldn't a document allegedly completed in 1610, about a highly dramatic event – the "most newsworthy event of the day"[55] in Vaughan's account – be published until fifteen years after being placed in its final literary form? Of course, in the early modern period delays in publication were the norm, but in cases of highly topical and dramatic subjects like this one a hiatus of fifteen years deserves an explanation. Vaughan is swift to assure readers that the reason is – naturally – obvious: "Strachey's letter would not have pleased the Virginia Company in 1610 or for many years thereafter."[56] Unfortunately, this assertion, a longstanding hypothesis of the "standard thesis,"[57] is based on interpretative, intrinsically subjective evidence. If the manuscript was completed in 1610, the delay must be explained, and making Strachey's tract into a controversial or "subversive" account of the colonization effort is a convenient way to rationalize the delay. It also props up Vaughan's otherwise unsupported theory of Hakluyt as the editor responsible for the concluding *TD* extract: To make Strachey's tract more acceptable to Virginia Company authorities, asserts Vaughan, Hakluyt appended the *TD* extract, effectively "palliating" Strachey's "grim picture" of the Virginia Colony.

While this theory is not entirely without merit, it also seems strangely contradicted by the actual contents of the *TD* extract; although somewhat abbreviated, these hardly seem designed to "palliate" Strachey's negativism. Indeed, the appended *TD* excerpt recounts, among other Jamestown horrors, "miseries... violent storm...dissension... woes... negligence ...idleness... improvidence....mutinous loiterers...treasons...conspiracy...famine.... penury... piracy...ambush and murder by the Indians..." and "embezzlement of...provisions."[58]

Surely, for Vaughan to suggest that Hakluyt or anyone else would have added such a piece of narrative to Strachey's own account in order to "palliate" the image of the Jamestown colony is to run *ad hoc* from the Scylla of one uncomfortable proposition into the Charybdis of another.[59] Notwithstanding these apparent problems, Vaughan assures us that Strachey's letter would not only have incurred the official displeasure of the Virginia Company, but that the published documents of the wreck by contrast reflect the ambitions and policies of the Company: not only was *TD* a "palliative" antidote to Strachey's excesses, but Jourdain's *Discovery* was a piece of orthodox "company propaganda."[60] Vaughan also stresses that Hakluyt, to whom he assigns the responsibility for preparing Strachey's subversive account for publication, was a loyal and influential member of the Company. He seems unaware of the troubling contradiction posed by this scenario: Why would a Company loyalist attempt to "palliate" Strachey's document[61] by appending a second narrative that includes not only the previously mentioned colonial woes[62] but also prominent mention of the "tragical history of the man eating his dead wife," which details that the husband "cut her in pieces and hid her in diverse parts of his house"?[63] Indeed, Vaughan's argument ties itself up in knots; according to him, Hakluyt undertook the insertion of the TD passage with the aim of achieving "the widest possible circulation"[64] for Strachey's controversial manuscript. In the end, however, the loyal and talented Hakluyt only produced a document that, even after his palliations, "would not have pleased the...Company in 1610 or many years thereafter."[65] Vaughan's need to portray *Discovery* as the innocent counterpart to Strachey's tract leads him into manifest errors of fact, such as when he insists that Jourdain said "nothing at all about conditions in Virginia, even the abandonment of Jamestown on the eve of De La Warre's arrival."[66] The claim suggests a lack of attention on Vaughan's part, also evident in many other instances, to the relevant texts: Although his account is abbreviated and sanitized compared to Strachey's, Jourdain *does* discuss the decision of the demoralized and hungry colonists to return to England on the eve of De La Warre's arrival. [67]

But the absence of a coherent perspective leads to further unresolved, sometimes unconsidered, contradictions. Vaughan's insistence that Strachey's document was completed in Virginia on July 15, 1610, is joined to an elaborate defense of a scenario (of doubtful credibility) in which Hakluyt completes the same manuscript several months later in London. The presence of this unresolved contradiction suggests a need to reassure readers that, one way or another, Strachey's manuscript, in its published form, was available to influence Shakespeare in 1610: By laboring so earnestly to insist on Hakluyt's fall 1610 role as an editor, Vaughan

undermines the credibility of his claim that the manuscript in its entirety was completed in Virginia in July.[68] One may doubt, moreover, Vaughan's assumption that just because it appeared in print, Jourdain's *Discovery* was approved by the Virginia Company. Malone – who is not trying to construct a wishful tale in which *TD* is the authorized alternative to Strachey's unacceptable realism – notes that *Discovery* does not appear in the Stationers' Register, and proposes that this absence in the records is a sign of "apprehension…that [Jourdain's] publication might have been forbidden by authority."[69] This theory is more consistent with the available evidence, both external and internal, than is Vaughan's attempt to transform Jourdain's pamphlet into an orthodox, authorized publication. But if the independent agency of publishers, anxious for a bestseller, can ensure the publication of one "forbidden" pamphlet, why not another? Malone's analysis casts a spotlight on the implausible notion that opposition of the Virginia Company to Strachey's pamphlet, even if it existed, is *sufficient* to explain the long hiatus between *TR*'s composition and its publication.

Strachey's Plagiarism

Although Vaughan criticizes us for highlighting Strachey's well-deserved reputation as a plagiarist, ironically, he admits that Strachey "borrowed freely, unashamedly, and often without specific attribution"[70] from other writers.[71] Strachey's pattern of plagiarism is indeed extensive in *History of Travel* (*H of T*) — and by no means limited to his appropriations of Smith. It goes well beyond the examples Vaughan acknowledges, and is so firmly established in the critical literature (much of which Vaughan does not mention)[72] that examples have been cited from all his works. And while Vaughan admits that *H of T* "borrowed extensively from Captain John Smith's writings," as "has long been recognized," he also categorically insists that "that fact has nothing to do with 'True Reportory,' despite Stritmatter and Kositsky's assertions."[73]

This position is not only based on a misreading of Strachey's character and habits, but also depends on a misconception of the role of circumstantial evidence in historical analysis. The evidence for Strachey's plagiaristic habits[74] is sufficiently impressive to engender the speculation that one reason Strachey had such difficulty publishing his *H of T* – which despite circulating in at least three Jacobean manuscripts was not printed until the 19th century[75] – might well have been that his contemporaries, including the elite of the Virginia Company (by whom he was not rehired after his brief service as the Colony's secretary), looked askance at his copying habits. If so, this model might also help to explain *TR*'s delayed publication. In any case, given this pattern – two of Strachey's three major works were published posthumously – and given the unmistakable evidence of intertextuality between *TR* and several other Bermuda pamphlets, it strains credulity to claim, as Vaughan does, that Strachey's pattern of plagiarism is irrelevant to ascertaining the extent of *TR* copying from contemporaneous documents – and, consequently, its date of completion. To artificially isolate *TR* from an author whom even Vaughan

acknowledges was a habitual borrower, he must therefore stand our argument on its head, mistaking conclusions for premises and asserting that "Stritmatter and Kositsky's parallel column charts that purport to show Strachey purloining words and phrases from other texts are based on *the erroneous belief* that *TR* came last in the chronological sequence"[76] and referring to our "*mistaken belief* that *TR* was not completed until 1612."[77]

There is no basis in our article for these assertions. What Vaughan refers to as a "belief" was in fact a carefully elaborated hypothesis; if Vaughan wants to show that it was a "mistaken" hypothesis, he should do so through a critique of our argument rather than by spinning an entertaining but implausible narrative which misconstrues our case. Indeed, the better part of our essay is devoted to disproving the longstanding conviction, never grounded in a critical method, that *TR* was in fact completed on July 15, 1610. Instead, we argued, a preponderance of the evidence suggests a completion date of sometime in 1612;[78] our tables do not depend on this as an assumption, but serve to demonstrate that it is a logical *conclusion* grounded in relevant evidence.

According to Vaughan, it is based on this "mistaken belief" in a 1612 completion date that we accuse Strachey of "plundering most of his narrative and his subsequent *Virginia Britannia* from earlier or contemporaneous writers."[79] But, once again, the argument is a straw man. We did not "accuse Strachey of plundering *most of his narrative*....from earlier or contemporaneous writers"; our case that Strachey *was the likely borrower* from texts not available to him until after his return to England in 1611 was, however, based on several predicates, which Vaughan either mentions fleetingly or passes over altogether in his haste to substitute his own idiosyncratic version of our "belief" for an accurate summary of our actual analysis:

> 1) Strachey's well known reputation as a plagiarist of contemporaneous and earlier texts, as documented by Culliford, Da Costa, etc.;
> 2) TR's appropriation, evident on a close view to anyone familiar with the relevant texts, of numerous printed sources such as Eden, Hakluyt, etc., which give it the appearance of a literary document contrived or rewritten at leisure in London;
> 3) Apparent intertextuality showing previously unacknowledged or under-acknowledged connections between TR and contemporaneous documents such as TD;
> 4) The likely difficulty of obtaining books, writing supplies, and sufficient leisure to compose a 24,000-word document in Jamestown;
> 5) Strachey's own statement, in his epistle dedicatory to *Lawes* (1612), that he is still working on an unfinished eyewitness account of his Virginia and Bermuda experiences.[80]

It seems ironic that Professor Vaughan can label us as being "in denial" of a scenario which is to him "obvious," while ignoring such telling elements of circumstantial evidence as Strachey's own published dedication to *Lawes*.

A second critique of our earlier article is in many ways similar to Vaughan's. In his 2009 *RES* article, "Dating William Strachey's 'A True Reportory of the Wracke and Redemption of Sir Thomas Gates': A Comparative Textual Study," Tom Reedy endeavors to demonstrate that our argument for the influence of *TD* on *TR* (one of several elements of our case for a *TR* manuscript not completed until 1612), is better explained by the premise that *TD* borrowed from *TR*. Reedy agrees with us that the evidence for intertextuality between *TD* and *TR* is beyond dispute. The only real question is whether one document depends on the other (and, if so, which one), or whether the two documents are instead linked by a common ancestor.

It is important to note that the author of *TD* acknowledges the use of sources, explicitly "profess[ing] that he will relate nothing [concerning Virginia] but what he hath from the secrets of the Judicial Council of Virginia, from the letters of Lord la Warre, from the mouth of Sir Thomas Gates."[81] The "secrets"[82] from the members of "The Judicial Council of Virginia"[83] could include other written or verbal reports from Gates, as well as reports from Somers, Percy, Wainman, Newport—significant because Newport, as Captain, could supply special nautical information such as the ships' bearings, probably not determinable by non-mariners—Argall, Hamor, and several others.[84] We are also told that De La Warre contributed "letters," which demonstrates that he submitted, in addition to his dispatch, at least one other report to the company. Only two surviving documents fit the description of "letters" from De La Warre (Harl. 7009.58 and a letter to Lord Salisbury), but it is certainly plausible that there were originally more.

The De La Warre dispatch, dated July 7 (a week before the terminal date in Strachey's *TR* text), is one of the most obvious common sources for *TD* and *TR*[85] and in fact shares extensive language with both. But it also appears that Strachey and the writers of *TD* made use of a document originating with George Percy or other early colonists, for both *TR* and *TD* narrate events that took place in Virginia before Strachey arrived there.[86] Culliford points out that Strachey borrows in *H of T* from Percy's manuscript copy of *Discourse of the plantation of the southerne colonie in Virginia by the English*, 1606 (181), but echoes of Percy's manuscript of 1606 can also be found in *TR*.[87] Finally, it appears that there also existed at one time a secret report, attributed to Captain Newport, which would have been given to the council when Newport returned to England in September 1610.[88]

The abundance of possible shared sources for *TR* and *TD* invalidates the claim that *TR* influenced the composition of *TD*. The direct evidence, admittedly slight, suggests that if there is an unmediated connection between the two documents, Strachey is more probably the borrower. This was his pattern.

The Martin Letter

To Vaughan the theory that *TR* "was Strachey's response to a (Dec. 1610) letter from Richard Martin…requesting information about the Colony's… characteristics," is "implausible."[89] Once again, Vaughan misconstrues our position. Nowhere do we argue that *TR* "was Strachey's response to a letter from Richard

Martin." On the contrary, we analyzed Martin's letter as one of several significant circumstantial elements in the case against the scenario that *TR* in (or near to) its eventual *published* form had been transmitted to England in fall 1610. This is because, among other elements contained in Strachey's document, such as the storm and shipwreck, life on Bermuda, and many pages of materials also contained in the 7 July de La Warre dispatch, *TR* details answers to a number of the questions posed in Martin's letter.[90] The available evidence suggests that Strachey incorporated into *TR* elements of a response composed as a separate, much shorter document, answering Martin's queries, as he appears to have kept copies of everything he wrote or came across.[91] If correct, this scenario confirms other evidence supporting a post-1610 terminus a quo for the finished version of *TR*. If the scenario is wrong, on the other hand, then Vaughan should answer a question he ignores: If Strachey's letter was transmitted to England in fall, 1610, why would Martin, as Secretary of the Virginia Company, in December have needed to ask questions already answered in that document? But in place of thoughtful deliberation, Vaughan misstates our position and responds to something we did not say.[92]

B to the Rescue

Inexplicably, Vaughan introduces as part of his case a 19th century manuscript copy[93] of "an earlier version"[94] of *TR* (hereafter referred to as "B") discovered in Bermuda in a Tucker family trunk in 1983[95] and reprinted in 2001 by Ivor Noël Hume. A number of Vaughan's conclusions, including his assessment that B represents an anterior state of *TR*, that it "contains clear internal evidence that it is not simply a poor transcript of the Hakluyt-Purchas version,"[96] and that the manuscript "raises intriguing possibilities"[97] seem beyond reasonable dispute. Others seem less plausible. Vaughan is confident that B is an asset to the traditional view of Strachey's manuscript: Strachey is indubitably the author of B,[98] the revision of B into *TR* took place in Virginia, and the motivation for the revision can be traced to Strachey's ambition to promote himself within the Company. Strachey not only "saw an opportunity for further advancement" through his pen, but understood that the Bermuda shipwreck narrative "was bound to be popular back home," and set out while still in Jamestown to expand the document, "borrowing more freely from other writers (by memory or, more probably, from books available in Jamestown)…."[99] As appealing as this scenario may sound, it is fancifully improbable for several reasons; moreover, it depends on an intrinsic contradiction, as Vaughan acknowledges: "Why Strachey did not foresee the Company's displeasure at his account of those weeks is hard to fathom."[100]

Most important, it is far less clear that the B manuscript supports the traditional view of Strachey's influence on *Tempest*; on the contrary, it tends instead to confirm our own view, as articulated in *RES*, that *TR* in its subsequently published form did not go back to England on the July 1610 Gates voyage. In fact the B manuscript represents the best possible evidence supporting an alternative to the scenario Vaughan confidently identifies as not only "obvious" but "virtually

certain":[101] If some version of the Strachey document, which in its published form runs to 24,000 words, returned on the 1610 Gates' voyage, it was more likely a highly abbreviated version, far closer to B than the *TR* published fifteen years later by Purchas. Without knowing of the existence of the B manuscript,[102] we posited this scenario and suggested that only later, probably around 1612, would the original manuscript have been revised and amplified in England, taking into account numerous sources and resources likely not available in Virginia.

Many evident characteristics of B are consistent with this interpretation. B is an anonymous manuscript only one quarter the length of *TR*; it is markedly less literary in character than Purchas' published text, and uses fewer external sources: Except for one apparent passage from Oviedo, and some "storm set" details, much briefer than those in *TR,* which appear to have originated in other texts such as Tomson and De Ulloa in Hakluyt, B contains few hints of literary pretension or bookish influence. It contains almost none of the background from Eden, Willes, Acosta, Horace, Virgil, etc., that supplies *TR*'s literary and historical context. Also missing are the many elements from the de La Warre dispatch that are interwoven in Strachey's finished publication,[103] as well as those portions of *TR* that we identified as plausibly being written in response to Martin's December 1610 questions.[104] Finally, B is not addressed to a "noble lady" or anyone else.[105]

When one adds to all these considerations the testimony of Strachey's own 1612 dedication of *Lawes*, which refers to his as yet unperfected narrative of the "Bermudas…and…Virginia," recounting how he has "beene a sufferer and an eie witnesse," and promising that "*the full story of both in due time* shall consecrate unto your views…[and]deliver them perfect unto your judgements,"[106] it is difficult to escape the impression that Vaughan's scenario of a *TR* manuscript completed by Strachey himself before July 15, 1610, amended by Hakluyt in late 1610, and passed on to Shakespeare well before November 1611, is a house of cards liable to topple with the faintest critical breeze.[107] It is therefore predictable that Strachey's 1612 admission, which contradicts Vaughan's "just so" story, finds no place in his recent article. The implication is beyond reasonable doubt: Strachey refers to a Bermuda manuscript, plausibly similar to that now preserved in B, which he still intends, in 1612, to further develop before submitting to the Council in London.[108] In other words, B completes the circumstantial case for our original argument that *TR* in the form eventually published by Purchas was not completed until sometime during or after 1612, too late to have been a conceivable source for Shakespeare's *Tempest*.

"Now Bound For England"

Perhaps the most creative element in Vaughan's attempted refutation of our case involves an imaginative scenario invoked to explain the last days of Strachey's manuscript in Virginia before it left – as he believes – downriver on its way to England on Gates' voyage. In the passage immediately preceding the concluding interpolation from TD, the Purchas copy describes the departure of Sir Thomas Gates on the return voyage to England:

> And the fifteenth day of July, in the "Blessing," Captain Adams brought [the king of Warraskoyak, Sasenticum, and his son Kainta] to Point Comfort, where at that time (as well to take his leave of the lieutenant general, Sir Thomas Gates, now bound for England, as to dispatch the ships) the lord governor and captain general had pitched his tent at Algernon Fort. The king's son, Kainta, the lord governor and captain general hath sent now into England until the ships arrive here again the next spring, dismissing the old werowance and the other with all terms of kindness and friendship, promising further designs to be effected by him, to which he hath bound himself by divers savage ceremonies and admirations.[109]

According to Vaughan, the phrase "now bound for England" in the concluding passage before the transitional sentence introducing the *TD* excerpt means that the ships were anchored at Point Comfort but "ready to cross Chesapeake Bay and enter the Atlantic as soon as winds and tide permit."[110] During this wait, the ships were able to "take on whatever small cargo went down the river that day, *almost certainly* including several letters besides Strachey's."[111]

This scenario, which Vaughan does not substantiate with factual evidence, is at best implausible. To begin with, both "now" and "bound for" are ambiguous, and can either mean – as Vaughan prefers – that a ship is waiting to leave, or that it has already left port. "Bound for" can even mean that a ship is in mid-ocean as many examples from the period attest.[112] Vaughan's definition of "now,"[113] misleadingly, omits all *OED* definitions except for the one which supports his case, effectively depriving the reader of the opportunity to consider for himself or herself which definition is most pertinent to the passage.[114]

Omission of relevant *OED* definitions is, however, only one of several flaws in Vaughan's argument on this point. Even more interesting, for example, is the final sentence describing the sailing of Gates' fleet: "The king's son, Kainta, the Lord Governor and Captain General, *hath sent now* into England until the ships arrive here again the next spring."[115] The most natural interpretation of this phrase, based on comparative evidence, is that it was written after the mid-July 1610 sailing of the fleet, by a writer who was either still in America (with his unfinished manuscript), or possibly back in England imaginatively positioning himself as still in America for the edification of an actual or imagined noble patron; the usage "hath sent" places the action squarely in the past.[116] Strachey, himself, writing of what one must assume is the July 15 sailing of the fleet (as there is no mention anywhere of other ships going to England in July), uses a similar construction to indicate past action:

> The ninth of July (1610), [Gates] prepared his forces, and early in the morning set upon a town of theirs, some four miles from Algernon Fort, called Kecoughtan, and had soon taken it without loss or hurt of any of his men. The governor and his women fled (the young King Powhatan's

> son not being there), but left his poor baggage and treasure to the spoil of our soldiers; which was only a few baskets of old wheat and some other of peas and beans, a little tobacco, and some few women's girdles of silk, of the grass silk, not without art and much neatness finely wrought; of which *I have sent* divers into England (being at the taking of the town), and *would have sent* Your Ladyship some of them had they been a present so worthy.[117]

In itself this passage supplies compelling reason to reject Vaughan's traditionalist scenario, however forcefully articulated, that Strachey's document as later published by Purchas returned to England on the July 1610 Gates voyage. Strachey's "would have sent" is in the conditional perfect; when added to the perfect tense, it confirms unambiguously that the described events are both past and completed; the ships have already sailed, and Strachey is excusing himself, after the fact, for not having sent any of the girdles to the "noble lady."

In place of such close textual analysis, which at every turn undermines his assumptions, Vaughan argues in large measure through the construction of an imaginative narrative scenario: "Officials at Point Comfort," we are informed, "communicated [during this period] intermittently with Jamestown by small vessel."[118] While it seems natural to assume that such a system must have existed, its relevance to Vaughan's narrative seems doubtful at best. For one thing, he omits to mention that the upriver and downriver trip could each have taken as long as two days.[119] The scenario is, however, *necessary* to justify Vaughan's conviction that Strachey sent the manuscript downriver from Jamestown to the departing ship.[120] According to Vaughan, Strachey completed his missive on July 15 at Jamestown, "perhaps early in the day," and "several letters besides Strachey's" were "almost certainly"[121] transmitted on the same boat while the ships were waiting at Point Comfort for the right sailing conditions. Once again, the convenient phrase, "almost certainly," transmutes conjecture into fact, erasing the chronological and practical improbabilities invoked by Vaughan's scenario. Vaughan has not demonstrated that such a system was in place for the period mentioned, or that the Strachey document was finished, or that it was transmitted by water from Jamestown, yet now several other letters have "almost certainly" joined the *TR* manuscript on its wholly hypothetical downriver voyage. One wonders if, after taking note of the tide and the weather, the helmsman was obliged to wait, possibly during as long as two days, for Strachey's very important document and entourage of ghostly letters to wend their way to Point Comfort.

One may well wonder, also, why Vaughan goes to such lengths to invent a scenario in which Strachey's document (as later published as *TR*) was transmitted downriver from Jamestown to Point Comfort at the last minute before the Gates ships departed on or about July 15. In part the scenario is an expedient to counter the straightforward proposition that a version of B, not *TR*, returned to England on Gates' voyage. But Vaughan is also anxious to reconcile a troubling anomaly in

Strachey's New World narratives. At issue is an anecdote, recounted in both *TR* and *H of T*, but in different versions. In *TR* the son of the local chief Sasenticum, Kainta, leaves for England on one of the departing ships, probably *The Blessing*. In *H of T*, however, the native son – now named Tangoit and with a different father, Tackonekintaco – does not go to England, but is substituted for a nephew who is imprisoned on the Delawarr before escaping.

These differing versions pose problems for Vaughan, even though he is confident that both refer to the same event "because it happened in 1610 at Point Comfort just before Newport left for England with Gates."[122] Vaughan's scenario of the ships transporting *TR* downriver at the last minute while Strachey remained in Jamestown is constructed to solve the riddle of why Strachey would present the same episode differently in his two accounts. It simultaneously obviates the need to question Strachey's reliability as a historical witness and allows Vaughan to convert the discrepancy into an attempted *coup de grace* to our view that *TR* was not placed in its final form until after Strachey had returned to England. According to him,

> Strachey *must have* learned the first of these details after he put his letter aboard the *Blessing* or the *Hercules* and *he may not have heard the whole story until the ships were on the Atlantic and de La Warre was back at Jamestown.* Had Strachey had the opportunity, he would, of course, have corrected his account of the negotiations with Powhatan...[123]

Although Vaughan is uncompromising in 2008 that the account in *H of T* must be the correct one, as recently as 2006 he was far less certain:

> Perhaps a third Powhatan visitor [to England] was Kainta, son of a local chief, captured by the English during the intermittent hostilities and – again, according to Strachey -- 'sent now [c. July 1610] into England, untill the ships arrive here againe the next Spring.' But Kainta may not have left Chesapeake Bay. Strachey's subsequent account of the Chief's son relates that the English accepted a substitute hostage, who soon escaped.[124]

We cannot be sure which of the two versions is correct, according to Vaughan, because "There is no further evidence."[125] This is Vaughan's way of acknowledging that the sole source of this dramatic anecdote, in either version, is William Strachey. It appears nowhere else in the Bermuda narratives.

Further problems must be glossed over to make Vaughan's story plausible. There is a discrepancy in names besides those of the Werowance and his son. Strachey disagrees with himself about the name of the Captain who transported the Indians to Point Comfort. In *TR* it is Adams, and in *H of T* Newport.[126] Vaughan hastens to assure readers that the name differences of the Indian father and son are irrelevant, as natives often had more than one name: "The names of two Indians, but not their identities, are different."[127] But authorities on early

Virginia history contradict Vaughan's assertion: According to Lyon Gardiner Tyler, Sasenticum and Tackonekintaco were not the same person, Sasenticum being a minor Werowance of the village of Mathomank on Burwell's Bay.[128] John Bennett Boddie agrees (in identical language), adding that Tackonekintaco was the Werowance of Karraskoyak.[129] The two sites, both located on the western bank of the James River downriver from Jamestown,[130] are clearly marked on John Smith's map as different villages.

Perhaps the most damaging contradiction in Vaughan's account is also the most obvious: if Strachey was not in Point Comfort to begin with, how would he have known that a native youth – by any name – had been taken prisoner only one day before the ship arrived? Karraskoyak was downriver from Jamestown, so the ship carrying the Werowance, his son, and "one of his chief men" could not have passed by it. According to Strachey, the captives arrived at Point Comfort July 15, the day that Vaughan (among others) states that Strachey completed his manuscript,[131] and put it aboard a boat to go downriver.[132] Obviously, this scenario does not work.

Finally, it deserves to be noted that Vaughan's theory requires the Virginia Colony Secretary to have sent back on the Gates voyage an account of "Kainta" that everyone aboard would have known to be false. If Strachey was, as Vaughan also assures us, laboring to ingratiate himself with the leadership of the Virginia Company, this hardly seems like an effective strategy.

Such compound problems suggest a different explanation for the varying versions of Strachey's account from the brittle scenario Vaughan labors so industriously to construct. Vaughan's explanation uses the *assumption* of Strachey's reliability as a historical narrator to help establish a scenario that otherwise suffers from its own credibility problems, and invokes contradictions that he does not acknowledge; it is worth recalling Vaughan's own admission that "Strachey related many events he had witnessed, but he also borrowed freely, unashamedly, and often without specific attribution."[133]

In this case it looks as though the first version of the two differing accounts may actually represent Strachey's creative rearrangement, to suit his own purposes, of a well documented and publicized event that, *according to several other independent sources*, had taken place not in 1610, but in 1608. In a spring 1608 dispatch to Spain, the Spanish ambassador Don Pedro De Zuniga wrote about a young Indian, Namontack, said to be a son of the chief, but more likely his servant, exchanged by Powhatan for an English youth named Thomas Savage. Namontack was put aboard Newport's ship in early 1608 and taken to England, from whence he later returned. These events survive in several slightly differing accounts,[134] including one by John Smith:

> With many pretty Discourses to renew their old acquaintance, this great King [Powhatan] and our Captain spent the time, till the ebb left our Barge aground. Then renewing their feasts with feats, dancing and singing, and such like mirth, we quartered that night with Powhatan. The next day Newport came ashore and received as much content as

> those people could give him: a boy named Thomas Savage was then given unto Powhatan, whom Newport called his son; for whom Powhatan gave him Namontack his trusty servant, and one of a shrewd, subtle capacity. Three or four days more we spent in feasting, dancing, and trading, wherein Powhatan carried himself so proudly, yet discreetly (in his Savage manner) as made us all admire his natural gifts, considering his education.[135]

Another incident from around 1609, recorded by George Percy in *A True Relation,* may have served to inspire Strachey's *H of T* version, in which the native boy escapes the fate of being brought to England by jumping ship and possibly drowning. In *H of T* Strachey states that

> The imposture nephew, privie before hand to the falcehood of the old man, watchinge his opportunity, leapt over bord one night (being kept in the Delawarr); and to be more sure of him at that tyme, fettered both leggs togither, and a sea gowne uppon him, yet he adventured to get clier by swiming, and either to recover the south shoare, or to sinck in the attempt. Which of either was his fortune we knowe not, only (if he miscarried) we never found his body nor gowne...[136]

Percy's account from 1609 reproduces a similar anecdote:[137]

> Captain Martin did appoint with half of our men to take the Island... Martin seized the king's son and one other Indian and brought them bound unto the Island where I was, when a ship boy, taking up a pistol accidentally, not meaning any harm, the pistol suddenly fired and shot the Savage prisoner into the breast. And thereupon what with his passion and fear he broke the cords asunder where with he was tied and did swim over unto the main with his wound bleeding.[138]

Although there is no final proof that either of these sensational incidents was the inspiration for Strachey's accounts in *TR* and *H of T*, it is interesting to note the impressive similarities, as well as to remember that it is to Strachey, and Strachey alone, that we owe record of an Indian boy (by any name) on the verge of being transported to England on Gates' boat, whereas the 1608 "Namontack" anecdote was mentioned by several independent sources, and so appears to be factual.

If this were the only discrepancy of this kind in Strachey's narratives, we would be inclined to ignore it. But given that his is the only contemporaneous account of the Bermuda wreck that includes reference to St. Elmo's Fire, the decision to cut down the mainmast, and the possible splitting of the ship, one may be forgiven the suspicion that Vaughan is right to emphasize the extent to which Strachey "borrowed freely and unashamedly" from other sources — including both Smith and Percy elsewhere in his works — and that he did so in order to enhance the literary appeal of his narratives, sometimes at the expense of historical accuracy.

"Modern Challenges": A Response

As we have seen, Vaughan neglects the influential skepticism of such 19th-century critics of Malone's actual theory as Elze or Hunter, whose criticisms of the theory of Jourdain's influence eventually induced Furness and Luce to devise the modern view implicating *TR* instead. His summary of modern challenges to the "standard thesis" of Strachey's influence is equally idiosyncratic. For example, rather than citing our detailed *RES* analysis of the many reasons for supposing that the scenario of Strachey completing *TR* in Virginia is implausible, he cites a third-party source, quoting Lynne Kositsky's informal verbal remarks at a Concordia University debate.[139] To revert to our case as originally articulated in *RES*,

> Circumstances in Jamestown during the weeks Strachey allegedly composed the letter could not have been worse. When the Bermuda survivors returned to Virginia in May 1610, they had discovered a settlement burnt and in ruins (Wright 63-65, Major xxvi-xxvii). Under such circumstances, paper and books must both have been in limited supply. And yet, Strachey's letter, approximately 24,000 words in length, makes copious use of at least a dozen external sources, some mentioned by name, others silently appropriated.[140]

Only by ignoring our actual, well-defined position in print and relying on a third-party account of verbal remarks at a conference, can Vaughan reduce this multivariable analysis to the *reductio ad absurdum* of whether there was enough paper for Strachey to complete his 24,000 word manuscript in Virginia.[141] As is evident from all accounts of the circumstances in the Colony during the weeks in which Vaughan insists Strachey completed the *TR* manuscript, including Strachey's own, the likelihood that paper was in short supply was only one of several challenges that Strachey would have faced in composing his document in Virginia.

Another of Vaughan's more unfortunate mistakes occurs when he accuses us of mistaking evidence that he himself evidently fails to understand. Thus, according to Vaughan,

> The authors sometimes miss the message in the very words they select for comparison. Although they position "True Reportory" after Strachey's *Virginia Britania* (1612), they fail to notice that while *Virginia Britania* says that Virginia's Cape Henry is named "in honour of that our most royall deceased prince," "True Reportory" reports the cape to have been named "in honour of our young Prince." Implicitly, Henry is still alive. The sequence of the texts is obviously not what Stritmatter and Kositsky imagine it to be.[142]

There are several errors here. First, we did not claim that *H of T* was a *TR* source, or that it was written before the latter text. What we said was that "many of the sources identified as influences on *H of T*, [i.e., Virginia Britania*]* a book written in England between 1612 and 1618, also influenced *TR*, suggesting that this work or parts of it may likewise have been written in England, using the same "reference library," long after July 1610."[143] These include Smith's *Map*, which, as our table shows, seems to have influenced both *H of T* and *TR*.

Vaughan's mistake, moreover, is based on a flawed understanding of the known facts,[144] which he could have ascertained either by consulting the original *H of T* manuscripts, or simply heeding the analysis of Strachey's biographer Culliford, who clarifies that the language Vaughan erroneously supposes original to *H of T* was not added until around 1617:

> We do not know in what month in 1612 A Map of Virginia [by Smith] was published, but it must have been early in the year, since the fair copy of The Historie of Travaile was completed before November 6th of that year, when Prince Henry died and his younger brother Charles became Prince of Wales. Strachey, quoting Smith [without attribution – S. & K.] tells us, "The Cape of this bay, on the south side, we call Cape Henry, in honour of our most Royall Prince…The north foreland of this bay, which the Indians terme Accowmack, we call Cape Charles, in honour of our Princely Duke of York." *This is altered in the copy presented to Bacon in 1618 by the insertion of "deceased" before "Prince" and the changing of "Our Princely Duke of York" to "our now Prince, at that time Duke of York." These additions appear to have been made in 1617*; hence all three copies of the manuscript must have been completed before the death of Henry.[145]

True Reportory* and *Tempest

According to Vaughan, only two pages into his analysis, it is "*almost certain* that two or more manuscript versions of Strachey's letter circulated within the Company and, presumably, among some of its friends"[146] shortly after Gates arrived in London. By the end of Vaughan's entertaining narrative it has become a "*virtual certainty* that Strachey's letter reached London in September 1610" and an "*overwhelming probability* that at least two copies circulated widely among company officials and their friends."[147] One of the earliest beneficiaries, naturally, was Hakluyt, who, we are assured, "had immediate access" to the manuscript;[148] another was the author of TD, presumably revising his work for publication, who likewise "*almost certainly* had a copy of Strachey's letter on hand as he wrote the Company's apologia."[149]

The extent of Vaughan's dependence on self-assured phrases of this kind should, we submit, suggest a basis for the very doubt he intends to obviate. Like most critical links in the chain of his argument, Vaughan leaves largely undefended

the notion that a clear case can be made for the intertextuality of *Tempest* and Strachey's narrative. He assures us of the "virtual certainty" that Strachey's manuscript made it to England in time to be edited and revised by Hakluyt and then passed off to Shakespeare in some smoky tavern in the winter of 1610-1611. We are expected to overlook the contradiction that although this highly sensitive document could not be published, as it was regarded by the Virginia Council as an extremely dangerous document, it was freely made available to the dramatist for the purposes of composing a public play. But let us concede that all this, although seemingly implausible, is not impossible, and ask: what use did Shakespeare make of the gift? Unless there is independent evidence "from sign" for Strachey's influence on Shakespeare, Vaughan's elaborate defense of the premise that Shakespeare *could have seen* and copied *TR* is pointless. And if such independent evidence really existed, Vaughan's narrative of how Shakespeare got his Strachey would also be irrelevant; we would know, empirically, that somehow he did, and could willingly suspend disbelief as to how.

The plausibility of Vaughan's case therefore depends heavily on his assumption that the question of Strachey's direct influence is beyond reasonable dispute: "Most readers of *The Tempest* have found its congruities with the "close at hand 'True Reportory' too numerous and too vivid to be coincidental";[150] consequently he insists that "it is beyond the scope of this essay to retrace every resonance of Strachey's letter in Shakespeare's play."[151] Instead, like Hume, Vaughan depends on the hallowed tradition that "the Shakespeare connection…is a non-issue. That the playwright took his theme from accounts of the wreck and salvation of Somers' company….*cannot be doubted*."[152]

Vaughan identifies "three lengthy assessments" on which this conviction depends – Morton Luce's "Parallel Passages" appended to the 1901 Arden *Tempest*, Robert Ralston Cawley's 1926 survey,[153] and David Kathman's 1996 internet list.[154] We ask to what extent do these studies actually establish that Strachey's influence is "beyond a reasonable doubt?"[155] Our detailed reply to the most recent and comprehensive of these treatments[156] fails to inspire confidence in the credibility of the traditional case for Strachey's literary influence. After exhaustive analysis of Kathman's evidence (which reproduces nearly every salient piece of evidence from the earlier treatments to which Vaughan alludes), we concluded that

> The evidence for Shakespeare's alleged reliance on Strachey's Bermuda narrative can no longer be accepted as substantive. In nearly every case cited by Kathman, the earlier sources or Shakespeare himself supplies as good or better examples of intertextuality. The possibility that Shakespeare relied instead, primarily, on some combination of the noted sources -Eden and either Ariosto or Erasmus - all available to him much earlier than 1611, can no longer be dismissed.[157]

Vaughan admits that "Shakespeare borrowed widely and eclectically" from "English and continental literature," and even that a thorough search might

"uncover earlier sources for many, if not most, of the *Tempest*'s similarities to 'True Reportory.'"[158] Strachey, however, "bundled them conveniently, if unintentionally, at just the right moment for dramatic adaptation," and therefore "the argument that Shakespeare could have gotten every detail of the storm, and every similarity of word and phrase from other sources stretches credulity to the limits."[159]

What stretches credulity to the limits, and beyond, is Vaughan's implication that Shakespeare is provably indebted to Strachey for "every detail of the [*Tempest*] storm." Indeed, it is doubtful that there is a credible basis to impute to Strachey *any kind* of influence on Shakespeare's storm scene, let alone the kind of transparent and comprehensive influence implied by Vaughan's loose phraseology. The basis for this doubt is simple and, oddly, has been overlooked or ignored for decades: The playwright himself had already anticipated in earlier works, perhaps with the assistance of such Renaissance commonplaces as Erasmus, Hakluyt, and Eden, almost all the dramatic storm elements realized in Tempest. As our 2005 online rebuttal to Kathman shows, with the possible exception of the St. Elmo's fire detail, every storm image motif Kathman (or any of Vaughan's other authorities) would derive from Strachey is *found in Shakespearean storm scenes and imagery long predating The Tempest* (See Appendix A for details).

As the only *Tempest* storm element arguably without such Shakespearean precedent, the St. Elmo's fire motif furnishes an apt illustration of the intrinsically inconclusive reasoning on which the Strachey theory has historically depended. Vaughan insists – without supplying the slightest justification – that "'True Reportory' was probably *The Tempest*'s immediate inspiration"[160] for the motif. But assertion does not make it so; Vaughan's source Cawley, who gives an impressive résumé of the numerous potential sources, both ancient and Renaissance, for the popular topic, provides a useful antidote to Vaughan's "probably":

> Douce (*Illustrations of Shakespeare*, London, 1839, p. 3) cites [St Elmo's Fire] in Pliny, Seneca, Erasmus, Schotti, Eden, and Batman. It is mentioned also by Hakluyt, Purchas, Thevet, Le Loyer, and as illustration in prose or verse it was used by Chapman, Phineas Fletcher, Gomersall, Bacon, Fulke Greville, Drayton, Thomas Watson, Drummond, Lodge, and Thomas Heywood. I am inclined to believe, therefore, *since the idea was obviously so current, that Gayley has slightly overestimated Shakspere's indebtedness to this particular version. That Strachey recalled it to his mind I have no doubt. But the features mentioned are common in the other versions.* Le Loyer (*Treatise of Specters*, London, 1605, fol. 67v), for instance, speaks of men who "see the fire .... to flie uppon their shippe, and to alight uppon the toppe of the mast." And Hakluyt, as Luce remarks (Arden ed., p. 163), has "beak" and "it would be in two or three places at once."[161]

Cawley anticipates Vaughan's conviction, forcefully attesting that he has "no doubt" that Strachey was responsible for calling the motif to Shakespeare's mind.

Strangely, however, all the evidence of his passage suggests a contrary conclusion. Not only does Cawley fail to offer evidence supporting Strachey's direct influence on Shakespeare, he even admits that "the features mentioned [by Gayley] are common to the other versions." On the other hand, Gayley, Cawley, Kathman, and Vaughan have all failed to notice that certain apparently unique characteristics of Pygafetta's account of St. Elmo's fire, as reproduced in Richard Eden's *Decades of the Newe Worlde*,[162] show clear evidence of having influenced Shakespeare's conception of the phenomenon as being the product of the "spirit" Ariel.[163] In Pygafetta's account we read not only that "there appeared in theyr shyppes certeyne flames of fyre burnynge very cleare.... uppon the masts of the shyppes," but that, uniquely, *"sum ignorant folkes thynke [these] to bee spirites or such other phantasies*."[164] Although Shakespeare seems to have known more than one account of St. Elmo's fire, only from Eden could he have taken inspiration for the idea embodied in his play that the phenomenon is caused by Ariel-like "spirits."[165]

Vaughan's list of thematic parallels between *The Tempest* and Strachey's text follows the pattern, established by Luce, Cawley, and Gayley, of alternating attestation of belief with flimsy evidence, uncomplicated by any obligation to consult alternative sources to test the reliability of alleged correlations. Vaughan claims, for example, that in both Strachey and *Tempest,* "the island refuge is bountiful but troubled by storm and rife with danger from its other denizens."[166] We are at a loss to understand what "denizens" of Bermuda threatened the English survivors in Strachey's narrative. Likewise, Vaughan asserts that in both texts "everyone aboard miraculously survives, while the remainder of both fleets sail safely toward their destinations."[167] But Vaughan is apparently not aware, first, that not all the other ships of the third supply made it to Jamestown,[168] or second – and more significantly – that comparison of Shakespeare's specific language with that found in the same account of Pygafetta from which he took the idea of "spritely" St. Elmo's fire, shows – conclusively – that the real source of this *Tempest* motif is Eden (Table One):

by reason whereof, they so wandered owte of theyr course and were *disparsed in sunder*, that they in maner dispayred to *meete ageyne.* But as God wolde, *the seas and tempest being quieted,* they came safely to theyr determined course... (217v).	and for the rest o' th' fleet (*Which I dispers'd)*, they *have all met again*, And are upon the Mediterranean float Bound sadly home for Naples... (1.2.232-35)

Table One: Pygafetta (left) in Eden and *Temp*. 1.2.232.-35 (right).

Vaughan's avoidance of Eden's demonstrable *Tempest* influence leads to many similar instances of exaggerated confidence in the theory of Shakespeare's

dependence on Strachey. "In both texts," he asserts, "conspiracies among the shipwrecked Europeans threaten the lives of the leaders and the islands' tranquility."[169] But in our analysis of Eden, we have shown that the same pattern occurs over many pages of Eden's extensive narration, which details numerous conspiratorial plots of conquistadors in the new world;[170] moreover, unlike Strachey or the Bermuda pamphlets generally, Eden also furnishes a model for the *Tempest* portrait of Caliban as a rebellious savage enslaved by Prospero's magic, an image which, as Tristan Marshall has suggested, recalls "Spanish printed accounts of their exploits in South America,"[171] of which Eden's *Decades* was by far the most influential. Only Eden, likewise, could have suggested to Shakespeare the *Tempest* pattern in which the old world plots of Italo-Spanish dynasties (Prospero's dethroning by Antonio and Alonso) furnishes the seeds of "new world" conspiracy and revolt. Indeed, Eden's translation of Peter Martyr's book alludes to the real-world intrigues of the Milanese Sforzas[172] and their Aragonese relations – for whom the names "Alonso" and "Ferdinand" were hereditary – in plots and counterplots that provide a historical template for the sibling contretemps between Prospero and Antonio, and Alonso's similar betrayal of Prospero, in Shakespeare's play.

But Vaughan is so concerned to fit the square peg of Strachey's narrative into the round hole of Shakespeare's play that he is forced to deny the humanity of Caliban in order to suit his argument that the *Tempest* landscape, like Bermuda, is without native inhabitants.[173] It may be worth recalling, in response, that Shakespeare's drama begins with a party of shipwrecked Italo-Spanish Milanese and Neapolitans on a Mediterranean island located just off the route between Tunis and Naples.[174] It is already well-peopled with spirits, refugees (Prospero and Miranda), and a native islander – who, contrary to Vaughan's implication, we safely regard as being every bit as human as the recently shipwrecked Europeans.

We do not propose here to offer a comprehensive critique of the three lengthy treatments that Vaughan cites in support of the traditional but still largely unexamined view that, as Gayley extravagantly concludes, Shakespeare "knew his Strachey from first to last."[175] Nor can we do more than point to a few reasons why Eden's *Decades of the Newe Worlde* furnishes a *Tempest* ur-text that is so much richer than Strachey that if its riches had been appreciated by 19th or 20th century critics, an entire history of modern critical error would have been obviated. A more comprehensive review of the substantiating evidence, "'O Brave New World': *The Tempest* and Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo,"* appeared in the Fall 2009 issue of *Critical Survey*. It should be evident, however, even from this brief treatment, that the thematic "parallels" which Vaughan cites in favor of Strachey's influence are either based on misconceptions or else far better answered by alternative sources, especially Eden (although the influence of such Mediterranean texts as *The Aeneid*[176] and *Orlando Furioso,*[177] as well as Erasmus' 'Naufragium,'[178] are also well attested in the critical literature and are far more intimately connected to the themes and symbolism of Shakespeare's play than any of the Bermuda pamphlets). It is thus no surprise that, after going to such extravagant lengths to propound his "just so" story about how Shakespeare got his tale, Vaughan concedes that "Shakespeare borrowed widely and eclectically" from "English and continental literature," and even that a thorough

search might "uncover earlier sources for many, if not most, of the *Tempest*'s similarities to 'True Reportory.'"[179]

True, Vaughan goes on from this admission to argue that, because "the abundant thematic and verbal parallels between the play and 'True Reportory' have persuaded generations of readers that Shakespeare borrowed liberally from Strachey's dramatic narrative,"[180] we are obliged to perpetuate the tradition of error on which this belief has depended. The irony is impressive. What matters is not so much what past readers of *The Tempest* allegedly have believed, but whether present and future readers will continue believing in a "just-so" story about how Shakespeare got his *Tempest* that is by now wearing intellectually threadbare.

Appendix A

Table of David Kathman's Alleged Storm Scene Influences with Antecedent Passages in Shakespeare. Motifs allegedly derived from Strachey were known to and used by Shakespeare years or decades before *Tempest* (After Stritmatter and Kositsky 2005)

"Parallels" between *True Reportory* and *Tempest* storms. Excerpted from David Kathman's "Dating the *Tempest*."	Other Shakespeare works with related language or themes. All citations from *Shakespeare Searched.*
1) The "Sea-Venture" was one of a fleet of nine ships which set out in 1609 to strengthen the English colony in Virginia; it carried Gates, the newly appointed Governor of Virginia, and his entourage. A storm separated the Sea-Venture from the other ships, and the rest of the fleet continued on safely to Virginia, assuming that Gates had drowned. And for the rest o' th' fleet (Which I dispers'd), they have all met again, And are upon the Mediterranean float Bound sadly home for Naples, Supposing that they saw the King's ship wrack'd, And his great person perish. (1.2.232-37)	*Elze writes: "Not only on Columbus's first voyage of discovery was the flag-ship separated from the others in a similar way, but also in Drake's voyage round the world (1577-1580) the same thing happened in the Straits of Magellan, so that Drake had to sail on alone along the west coast of America." (11)* *This very common pattern, found in several other narratives of the time, occurs, for example, in Tomson in Hakluyt (1600). There were eight ships in the fleet. They were on a voyage when a wind came up followed by a tempest, and "eight ships that were together were so dispersed that [they] could not see one another." Eventually the ships managed to find one another and sail away, but Tomson's ship was lost.* Our sever'd navy too Have knit again, and fleet, threatening most sea-like. *Antony and Cleopatra.* (3.13.205-206)

2) Strachey describes the storm as "roaring" and "beat[ing] all light from heaven; which like an hell of darknesse turned blacke upon us . . . The sea swelled above the clouds, which gave battel unto heaven" (6-7). In *The Tempest*, Miranda describes the waters as being in a "roar," and says that "The sky it seems would pour down stinking pitch, / But that the Sea, mounting to th' welkins cheek, / Dashes the fire out." (1.2.1-5)	***Parallel phraseology is ubiquitous in Shakespeare, starting as early as Titus Andronicus, written more than sixteen years before Strachey's narrative:*** If the winds rage, doth not **the sea wax mad, Threatening the welkin** with his big-swoln face? And wilt thou have a reason for this coil? *Titus Andronicus* (3.1.224) I have seen **The ambitious ocean swell and rage and foam,** /To be exalted with the threatening clouds: But never till to-night, never till now, Did I go through **a tempest dropping fire**. Either there is a **civil strife** in heaven, Or else the world, too saucy with the gods, Incenses them to send destruction. *Julius Caesar* (1.3.6-7) **I never saw The heavens so dim by day**. A savage clamour! Well may I get aboard! This is the chase: I am gone for ever. *Winter's Tale* (3.3.60-63) I have seen two such sights, by sea and by land! but I am **not to say it is a sea, for it is now the sky: betwixt the firmament and it you cannot thrust** **a bodkin's point... now the ship boring the moon with her main-mast** , and anon swallowed with yest and froth, as you'd thrust a cork into a hogshead. *Winter's Tale* (3.3.88-91) The **sea**, with such a storm as his bare head In **hell-black night** endured, would have buoy'd up, **And quench'd the stelled fires…** *King Lear* (3.7. 67)

3) Strachey says that "Our clamours dround in the windes, and the windes in thunder. Prayers might well be in the heart and lips, but drowned in the outcries of the officers" (7); in the play the boatswain says, "A plague upon this howling; they are louder than the weather, or our office" (1.1.36-7), and a few lines later the mariners cry, "To prayers! To prayers!" (1.1.51).	***Again the concept Kathman would derive from Strachey was used by Shakespeare at least by 1599, the generally accepted date for*** **Henry V**: humbly **pray them** to admit the excuse… Behold, the English beach Pales in **the flood** with **men, with wives, and boys,/ Whose shouts and claps out-voice the deep-mouth'd sea**… *Henry V*, prologue, 5.9-11. **how the poor souls roared**, and the **sea mocked them**; and how the poor gentleman roared and the bear mocked him, both roaring louder than **the sea or weather.** *Winter's Tale* (3.3.104-105)
4) Strachey tells how "in the beginning of the storme we had received likewise a mighty leake" (8); Gonzalo says the ship in the play is "as leaky as an unstanched wench" (1.1.47-48).	***Nor did Shakespeare require Strachey to instruct him that ships sometimes leaked:*** **Leak'd is our bark** *Timon of Athens* (4.2.23) **Her boat hath a leak** *King Lear* (3.6.17) ***Or that "leaky" could be a metaphor:*** Sir, sir, thou'rt **so leaky** *Antony and Cleopatra* (3.11.80)

5) Strachey says that "there was not a moment in which the sodaine splitting, or instant oversetting of the Shippe was not expected" (8); the mariners in the play cry, "We split, we split!" (1.1.61).	***Or that ships "split":*** That the ship Should house him safe is **wreck'd and split** *Pericles,* Prologue to Act 2 (31-32) Assure yourself, after **our ship did split…** *Twelfth Night* (1.2.9) Whiles, in his moan, the ship **splits** on the ro ck… *3 Henry VI* (5.4.10)
6) Strachey tells how "we . . . had now purposed to have cut down the Maine Mast" (12); the boatswain in the play cries, "Down with the topmast!" (1.1.34).	***Or that masts were blown overboard or taken down:*** What though **the mast** be now blown overboard, The cable broke, the holding-anchor lost, And half our sailors swallow'd in the flood? *3 Henry VI* (5.4.3-5)

7) Strachey tells how the sailors "threw over-boord much luggage . . . and staved many a Butt of Beere, Hogsheads of Oyle, Syder, Wine, and Vinegar, and heaved away all our Ordnance on the Starboord side" (12). Stephano says that "I escap'd upon a butt of sack which the sailors heav'd o'erboard" (2.2.121-22), and later tells Caliban to "bear this away where my hogshead of wine is" (4.1.250-51); both Caliban (4.1.231) and Alonso (5.1.299) call the stolen apparel "luggage."	***In Strachey, the "luggage" is thrown overboard, and many of the casks are "staved" – pierced so that the drink ran out and into the sea. In Tempest, Stephano survives drowning by floating ashore on a full hogshead of wine, which he later consumes with the revelers. Although we would never cite these discrepancies as evidence that Shakespeare could not have relied on an account such as Strachey's, it is obvious that the critical lexical items on which the comparison depends were part of his vocabulary long before Tempest was written:*** Come, bring your **luggage** nobly on your back *1Henry IV* (5.4.160) I must stay with the lackeys, with **the luggage** of our camp *Henry V* (4. 4.69-70) Kill the poys and **the luggage** … *Henry V* (4.7.1) Overboard: What though the mast be now blown **over-board**, The cable broke, the holding-anchor lost, And half our sailors swallow'd in the flood? *3 Henry VI* (5.4.3-5) I threw her **overboard** with these very arms. *Pericles* (5.3.21)

8) Strachey says that "who was most armed, and best prepared, was not a little shaken" (6); Prospero asks, "Who was so firm, so constant, that this coil / Would not infect his reason?" (1.2.207-08).	***Both the grammatical construction and the language is original to Shakespeare, repeated many times, not an imitation of Strachey:*** Or **who is he so fond** will be the tomb Of his self-love, to stop posterity? (Sonnet 3) **What is your substance**, whereof are you made, That millions of strange shadows on you tend? (Sonnet 53) ***Moreover, Shakespeare had also spontaneously linked them to the idea of a human "coil," in response to a terrifying storm, decades before conceiving Tempest:*** **If there were reason for these miseries**, Then into limits could I bind my woes: When heaven doth weep, doth not the earth o'erflow? If the winds rage, doth not the sea wax mad, Threatening the welkin with his big-swoln face? And **wilt thou have a reason for this coil ?** *Titus Andronicus* (3.1.220-225)
9) Strachey says that "Our Governour was . . . both by his speech and authoritie heartening every man unto his labour" (10); as soon as he appears, King Alonso says, "Good boatswain, have care. Where's the Master? Play the men"	***Kathman seems unaware that the phrase, "play the men" occurs in the Bible (Gen. and most Tudor trans., 2 Sam. 13.28; Gen. only, 1 Sam. 4.9; 2 Sam. 1.12, AV only), as well as being well attested in Shakespeare's earlier works:*** When they shall hear how we have **play'd the men.** *1 Henry VI* (1.1.17)

10) Strachey: "Sir George Somers . . . had an apparition of a little round light, like a faint Starre, trembling, and streaming along with a sparkeling blaze, halfe the height upon the Maine Mast, and shooting sometimes from Shroud to Shroud, tempting to settle as it were upon any of the foure Shrouds . . . running sometimes along the Maine-yard to the very end, and then returning . . . but upon a sodaine, towards the morning watch, they lost the sight of it, and knew not which way it made . . . Could it have served us now miraculously to have taken our height by, it might have strucken amazement" (11-12). **Ariel.** I boarded the King's ship; now on the beak, Now in the waist, the deck, in every cabin, I flam'd amazement. Sometimes I'ld divide, And burn in many places; on the topmast, The yards and boresprit, would I flame distinctly, Then meet and join. Jove's lightning, the precursors O' th' dreadful thunder-claps, more momentary And sight-outrunning were not (1.2.196-203)	***The account of St. Elmo's fire as part of the Bermuda tempest is unique to Strachey, which has provoked the suspicion that the event represents Strachey's literary embroidery, borrowed from one of a large number of precedent sources, which include Eden, Erasmus, Ariosto, De Ulloa, Tomson, etc. For the case that Shakespeare's version more closely resembles the account found in Eden, see Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Brave New World."*** ***Although this is the only one of Kathman's examples of storm motifs supposedly derived from the Bermuda literature for which there is no obvious precedent in Shakespeare, examples from Lear and Julius Caesar may prove an interesting point of reference:*** The **sea**, with such a storm as his bare head In **hell**-black night endured, would have buoy'd up, And quench'd **the stelled fires**… *King Lear* (3.7.65-67) *(Pliny called St. Elmo's Fire "stars".)* A tempest **dropping fire**… *Julius Caesar* (1.3.10)

11) Jourdain says that "all our men, being utterly spent, tyred, and disabled for longer labour, were even resolved, without any hope of their lives, to shut up the hatches" (4-5) and "were fallen asleepe in corners" (6); Ariel describes "The mariners all under hatches stowed, / Who, with a charm joined to their suff'red labor / I have left asleep" (1.2.230-32). Strachey mentions "hatches" four times (10, 10, 13, 25); Shakespeare in Act 5 again mentions "the mariners asleep / Under the hatches" (5.98-99), and the boatswain says, "We were dead of sleep, / And (how we know not) all clapp'd under hatches" (5.230-31).	***To Kathman it is significant that both Shakespeare and Jourdain – not Strachey – mention "hatches." The significant discrepancies between the two versions are, however, omitted from Kathman's essay: in Shakespeare the sailors fell asleep in the hold, i.e., under the hatches, but in Jourdain the water was so deep in the holds that they had given up hope of bailing it out, and wanted to shut the hatches up and stay above them. In Jourdain's text, moreover, the motif of sailors falling asleep in corners has nothing to do with the shutting of the hatches. Kathman has spliced together two unrelated passages in order to create a stronger impression of intertextuality.*** ***In any case, Shakespeare had been writing about hatches for at least twelve years before*** **Tempest:** If he come **under my hatches**, I'll never to sea again. *Merry Wives of Windsor* (2.1.19) And, in my company, my brother Gloucester; Who from my cabin tempted me to walk Upon the **hatches**: thence we looked toward England As we paced along Upon the giddy footing of the **hatches**, Methought that Gloucester stumbled; and, in falling, Struck me, that thought to stay him, overboard, Into the tumbling billows of the main. *Richard III* (1.4.9-18) I stood upon the **hatches** in the storm… *2 Henry VI* (3.2.104) Sir, we have a chest beneath the **hatches**, caulked and bitumed ready. *Pericles* (3.1.75-76)

12) Jourdain says that the sailors "drunke one to the other, taking their last leave one of the other" (5); in the play the boatswain says, "What, must our mouths be cold?" (1.1.52), after which Antonio complains, "We are merely cheated of our lives by drunkards" (1.1.56), and Sebastian says "Let's take our leave of him" (1.1.64).	***Kathman finds it significant that both Jourdain and Shakespeare mention sailors who had been drinking, but it is obvious that the cliché had occurred to Shakespeare long before Jourdain's account was written:*** Lives like a drunken sailor on a mast Ready with every nod to tumble down/Into the fatal bowels of the deep. *Richard III* (3.5.103-105) ***There is no mention in Jourdain (or Strachey) of the critical Tempest element that the negligence of the drinking sailors resulted in loss of life. For a parallel to this passage, we must turn to the earliest account of Henry May's Bermudian shipwreck in 1593:*** ***It was his fortune to have his ship cast away, upon the north-west part of the isle of Bermuda...The pilots… certified the captaine that they were out of all danger; so they demanded of him their wine of height, the which they had…After they had their wine, careless of their charge which they took in hand, being as it were drunken, through their negligence a number of good men were cast away (Foster 28).***

13) Strachey says that "death is accompanied at no time, nor place with circumstances so uncapable of particularities of goodnesse and inward comforts, as at Sea" (6); Gonzalo says, "Now would I give a thousand furlongs of sea for an acre of barren ground, long heath, brown furze, any thing. The wills above be done! But I would fain die a dry death" (1.1.65-68). 14) Strachey tells how "we were inforced to run [the ship] ashoare, as neere the land as we could, which brought us within three quarters of a mile of shoare" (13); Jourdain adds that the ship "fell in between two rockes, where she was fast lodged and locked, for further budging" (7). Ariel in *The Tempest*, after confirming for Prospero that the ship was "nigh shore" (1.2.216) says, "Safely in harbor / Is the King's ship, in the deep nook" (1.2.226-27).	***Surprisingly, Kathman does not notice that the idea of a nautical voyager preferring or being destined to a "dry death" occurs conspicuously in*** Two Gentlemen of Verona, ***a play written many years before*** Tempest: Go, go, be gone, **to save your ship from wreck**, Which cannot perish having thee aboard, **Being destined to a drier death on shore.** *Two Gentlemen of Verona* (1.1.139-141)
15) Strachey tells how "we were inforced to run [the ship] ashoare, as neere the land as we could, which brought us within three quarters of a mile of shoare" (13); Jourdain adds that the ship "fell in between two rockes, where she was fast lodged and locked, for further budging" (7). Ariel in *The Tempest*, after confirming for Prospero that the ship was "nigh shore" (1.2.216) says, "Safely in harbor / Is the King's ship, in the deep nook" (1.2.226-27).	My name, Pericles; My education....in arts and arms; Who, looking for adventures in the world, Was by the rough seas reft of ships and men, And after **shipwreck driven upon this shore.** *Pericles* (2.3.87-91) Whiles, in his moan, **the ship splits on the** rock, Which industry and courage might have saved? *3 Henry VI* (5.4.10-11)

Endnotes

[1] Vaughan, Alden. "William Strachey's 'True Reportory' and Shakespeare: a Closer Look at the Evidence," *Shakespeare Quarterly* Fall *2008,* 245-73.

[2] Stritmatter, Roger and Lynne Kositsky. "Shakespeare and the Voyagers Revisited," *Review of English Studies*, 58:236 (Fall 2007), 447-472.

[3] Abbreviations used in this article: *TR=True Reportory*; *TD=True Declaration of the Estate of the Colony in Virgini*a (S122265); *B*=Hume manuscript of early *TR* draft; Discovery=Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas* (S109240); *PP=Purchas His Pilgrimes* (S111862); *H of T= History of Travail in Virginia*.

[4] Vaughan, "Evidence," 245. In addition to challenging our presumed motives (to redate the *Tempest* before 1604), Vaughan disparages us as "the prominent anti-Stratfordians" who have "launched *an unparalleled attack*....on Strachey and his letter" (262; emphasis added). As this quotation illustrates, Vaughan's lack of objectivity is conspicuous in the prejudicial verbs used to summarize our discourse: not only do we "attack"; we also "charge"; "label"; "misrepresent" and "berate," and all in the same paragraph! These terms, however, are more indicative of Professor Vaughan's state of mind than they are descriptive of the actual tone and manner of our article. We did not "launch an unparalleled attack" on anything; however, we did invite readers to critically consider the unexamined "assumptions" – to again use Vaughan's own revealing word – bolstering the standard thesis of Strachey's influence on *The Tempest*.

[5] Malone, Edmund. *Account of the Incidents from which The Title and Part of the Story of Shakespeare's Tempest Were derived: and its True Date Ascertained*, 1808.

[6] Vaughan, "Evidence," 245.

[7] Vaughan, "Evidence," 267.

[8] Shaksper discussion group, 03/20/01, http://www.shaksper.net/archives/2001/0650.html. In Lindley's view, while "the Strachey letter is a *possible* source for *The Tempest,* it is not a *necessary* source, in the way that Ovid or Montaigne both are, nor does it provide a particular point of reference in the way that The Aeneid does." Accessed 2/7/09. Our emphasis. Lindley is of course, discussing only the direct evidence "from sign" for Strachey's influence on *Tempest,* not the circumstantial question of whether Strachey's text was completed in time for it to have even been a "possible" source.

[9] Gurr, Andrew. "*The Tempest*'s Tempest at Blackfriars," *Shakespeare Survey* 41, 91-102. In personal communication with the authors (11/28/05), Gurr confirms his belief that *Tempest* may be dated too early for Strachey to have been a source, even assuming a traditional scenario like Vaughan's.

[10] Elze, Karl. "The Date of *The Tempest*" in *Essays on Shakespeare*. Translated with the author's sanction by Dora L. Schmitz. London: Macmillan & Co., 1874.

[11] Hunter, Rev. Joseph. *Disquisition on the Scene, Origin, Date & etc. of Shakespeare's Tempest* (1839). Perhaps it is not surprising that Vaughan's summary of the traditions of doubt over the Strachey theory (245-46) is conspicuously devoid of any citations to the 19th century debate over the Malone theory. Citing this relevant scholarship – including such early critics of the Malone hypothesis as Hunter (1839) or Elze (1874), not to mention modern critics of the Strachey theory such as Lindley or Gurr, would have jeopardized Vaughan's implicit thesis that there is a necessary connection between skepticism over the "standard thesis" and either chronological revisionism or an anti-Stratfordian perspective.

[12] Muir, Kenneth. *The Sources of Shakespeare's Plays*, New Haven, Ct.: Yale University Press, 1977, 280.

[13] McCarthy, Penny. "Some *Quises* and *Quems*: Shakespeare's True Debt to Nashe," in *New Studies in the Shakespearean Heroine. The Shakespeare Yearbook*, 14 (2004), 176.

[14] Thus, in progressive sciences such as archaeology, where technological advances and robust research programs continue to recover additional data, the dates of sequences such as the earliest human habitation of the Americas, continue to be revised backward.

[15] Moreover, absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Some plays may not have been produced until long after their dates of composition or completion.

[16] Vaughan, "Evidence," 245.

[17] Vaughan, "Evidence," 245.

[18] Vaughan, "Evidence," 245.

[19] Luce, Morton (ed). *The Tempest*. London: Methuen & Co., 1902, summarizes: Malone's list "excludes the most important of all these contemporary documents, viz. Strachey's Reportory or Letter" (149). Instead of basing his case on Strachey, as Vaughan incorrectly implies, Malone's alleged verbal parallels (30-34) are based on Jourdain and TD.

[20] Vaughan, "Evidence," 273.

[21] Understanding how Malone and Luce each came to hold his opinion is essential to a full appreciation of the extent of Vaughan's own errors. Malone did identify a pamphlet, which he erroneously attributed to Strachey, as a possible candidate for Tempest influence. *The Proceedings of the English Colonie in Virginia*, from 1606 to the Present Year 1612, ascribed to "W.S." (xxx), actually written by John Smith, does not mention the Bermuda shipwreck, and today is not regarded, even by Vaughan, as a hypothetical *Tempest* source. Another Malone nominee, Sylvester Jourdain's *Discovery of the Barmudas* (1610; republished with emendations as by "W.C." in 1613), does describe the Bermuda shipwreck, and did manage to gain

traction during the 19th century as a possible *Tempest* source, only to be refuted – convincingly, in our view – by Hunter and Elze (and, ultimately, Furness) as improbable. Vaughan goes out of his way to minimize, as inimical to his monolithic view of critical history, the extended history of disagreement over the vector of influence through which the Somers wreck allegedly excited Shakespeare's imagination. This history, recounted in abbreviated form in our *RES* article, goes back to the 19th century disputes between Malone and his critics, most prominently Hunter and Elze, includes the confusions of Furness (1892), and continues up to the present in the lack of agreement between Vaughan and Hume over whether the B and *TR* (see our analysis below, FN 152) versions of the Strachey narrative constitute equally probable sources of *Tempest* influence.

[22] The development of the theory of Strachey's influence, up to and including Vaughan's article, constitutes a tangled web of misconstruction, assumption, and error, involving the critical intervention of at least half a dozen scholars, among whom Luce is only one critical link in the chain. Furness in 1892 had already successfully challenged some of Malone's misconceptions, given fair play to the objections of such 19th-century skeptics as Elze and Hunter, and named, for the first time *True Reportory* – which he had, however, not yet seen or read – as a hypothetical alternative to Malone's fourteen unfruitful speculations, but it remained for Luce to transform Furness' speculations into what would shortly become the "standard thesis." It is instructive to review, as Vaughan does not, the actual merits and weaknesses of the case Luce made for Strachey's influence (and, to a lesser extent, TD) on *Tempest*.

[23] Furness, Horace Howard. *The Tempest: A New Variorum Edition Shakespeare*. New York: Dover. 1964 reprint of 1892 ed. Furness was apparently first to propose that *The Tempest* might be indebted to a work by William Strachey. To match his source with the play, he invented an imaginary 1612 publication date for *True Reportory,* and then supposed that *The Tempest* itself was not written until 1613 (312-313).

[24] Stritmatter and Kositsky, 448 fn. 2. Furness accurately summarizes the view of Elze and Hunter – among others – that "the parallelisms which were to Malone so remarkable and so convincing in Jourdain's pamphlet, were either commonplace or non-existent" (313). Charles Mills Gayley, agreeing two decades later, concedes that "from none of [alleged parallels in the first pages] should we conclude that [Shakespeare] was dependent on Jourdain," and in the remainder of the book "there is nothing uniquely suggestive of any feature of Shakespeare's *Tempest*" (*Shakespeare and the Founders of Liberty in America,* New York, MacMillan, 1917, 48). This concession is remarkable given Gayley's corresponding confidence in Strachey's role in shaping The Tempest.

[25] Luce, Arden, xiii.

[26] Luce, Arden, xiv.

[27] Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Voyagers," 450.

[28] Or Hakluyt. See discussion, infra.

[29] Luce, Arden, 152; 154.

[30] Luce, Arden, 152.

[31] Harl. 7009, fol. 58.

[32] It might be argued that Luce's omission merely results from less strict standards of documentation employed in early 20th century scholarship, but this theory is contradicted by Luce's fastidious attention to bibliographical detail for the other texts in question (which differs only from wholly modern conventions by not listing STC numbers, which did not exist in 1902). His omission of the Purchas date is all the more conspicuous by contrast.

[33] Luce, Arden, 154; emphasis added.

[34] Luce, Arden, 154.

[35] Luce, Arden, 154.

[36] Vaughan, "Evidence," 251.

[37] Not only does Vaughan neglect to address the fundamental problems of whether Purchas applied his system consistently (he did not), but he also fails to clarify what Purchas' nomenclature was even *supposed* to denote. Vaughan's own analysis shows that the absence of a "P" *does not mean* that Purchas merely reprinted a received Hakluyt text unmodified. The extent of the modification required to justify, in Purchas' own mind, the addition of the "P" is not clarified by Vaughan's analysis, which instead depends on the reader's acceptance of unjustified assumptions convenient to Vaughan's argument. It is by no means obvious, as Vaughan requires, that Purchas would not add the *TD* conclusion to the Strachey document as descended through Hakluyt without feeling any obligation to append a "P" to the chapter's Table of Contents, or even remembering to do so. Vaughan's argument that Purchas would not have failed to annotate his modifications – because he would have been "proud" of his "collaboration" with Hakluyt – is to confuse a credible theory of Purchas' motivation with Vaughan's need to assure the reader that his scenario is the only plausible one.

[38] The passage from Strachey's narrative that would seem most objectionable to the Virginia company, namely his vivid description of the desolate condition of Jamestown on the 23 May 1609 arrival of the Bermuda survivors, is borrowed by Strachey from de La Warre's June 7 Dispatch to the Company: "Viewing the fort, we found the palisades torn down, the ports open, the gates from off the hinges, and empty (which owner's death had taken from them) rent up and burnt, rather than the dwellers would step into the woods a stone's cast off from them to fetch other firewood. And, it is true,

the Indian killed as fast without, if our men stirred but beyond the hounds of their blockhouse, as famine and pestilence did within" (Wright 64). While it is conceivable that the Virginia Company authorities would have opposed the publication of such a description, it is important to remember that similar vividly negative reports of colonial life are documented in the published literature of the day. For example, T*he New Life of Virginea: Declaring the former successe and present estate of that plantation Being the Second part of Nova Britannia,* a work "Published by Authoritie of his MAJESTIES COUNSELL of Virginea" in 1612 reports on Jamestown "as a hostile Campe within it selfe: in which distemper that envious man stept in, sowing plentifull tares in the hearts of all, which grew to such speedie confusion, that in few moneths, Ambition, sloth and idlenes had devoured the fruits of former labours, planting and sowing were cleane given over, *the houses decaied, the Church fell to ruine, the store was spent, the cattell consumed, our people starved, and the poore Indians by wrongs and injuries were made our enemies, two of the ships returning home perished upon the point of Ushant, the rest of the fleet came ship after ship, laden with nothing but bad reports and letters of discouragement*" (*Virtual Jamestown*; our emphasis; 1612)

[39] PP, 3.XXXI.2 (A3v).

[40] *PP*, 4.10.1950.

[41] *PP*, 4.10.1950. Our emphasis.

[42] *PP,* 4.1432. Our emphasis. We are indebted to Tom Reedy for these and following examples of Purchas' and Hakluyt's contrasting editorial styles.

[43] Vaughan "Evidence," 249.

[44] Vaughan "Evidence," 267. fn 55.

[45] Personal communication, 1/09.

[46] There are only five instances of the usage in *Principal Navigations*, once in the 1589 "To the Favourable Reader" (A4v) twice in the 1599 "Epistle Dedicatorie to Sir Robert Cecil" (A3v, A4v), and twice in an introduction on 1.53-54). Hakluyt doesn't use the expression when inserting material from other sources.

[47] Tom Reedy (personal communication) calculates that there are 43 total occurrences of such uses in *PP* (discounting the usage in Strachey); of these, 3 are in titles, 10 in marginal notes. Of the remaining 30, only 8 are clearly authorial (comparing PP with available original sources), and one is impossible to determine. Of the 22 clearly by Purchas, 9 do not refer to inserted material. Omitting Strachey, there are 11 examples of Purchas using the word as it is used in *TR*.

[48] Parks, George Bruner. *Richard Hakluyt and the English Voyages*. New York:, American Geographical Society, 10 (1928): 181-82.

[49] Parks, *English Voyagers*, 229. Notwithstanding such testimony, Vaughan confidently assures us that Hakluyt is not only responsible for the appended extract from *TD*, but also

"probably....for the one deletion in Strachey's text" (251) evident in the Purchas volume. For several reasons this is problematic. We are indebted to Tom Reedy for alerting us to C.R. Steele's analysis of the conveyance of material from Hakluyt to Purchas, published in *The Hakluyt Handbook* (D. B. Quinn, ed. Volume I. 1974): of 73 entries marked H by Purchas, 39, or 53 percent, were abbreviated by Purchas (83). An example is *A large relation of the Port Ricco Voiage; written, as is reported, by the learned man and reverend Divine Doctor Layfield,...Chaplaine and Attendant in that expedition*, which is marked only with an "H" in Purchas' table of contents, even though Purchas has clearly intervened with major deletions, and the title concludes with the phrase "very much abbreviated." The narrative itself begins on *PP* 4.1155, with a long introduction by Purchas that includes the following acknowledgment of the abridgement:

[This] is a copious discourse, which we have somewhat abridged; both in the former part of the History, which you already have from Him which best knew it; and in the rest, in some superfluities or digressions (seeming such at least to me, who having so much work, make myself more to make my reader less) providing nevertheless that not a drop of necessary blood be lost... (*PP* 4.1154).

The statistics compiled by Steele reinforce the portrait of Hakluyt's conservatism as given by Parks; contrary to Vaughan's argument, Hakluyt rarely engaged in significant deletions. Finally, one might also wonder how Vaughan can be so confident that this is *the only* deletion to Strachey's text. To transform the only *acknowledged* deletion into *the only* deletion, ignoring the possibility that other deletions may have occurred without editorial notification, is to engage in an act of faith. Moreover, in the effort to establish this unlikely scenario, which is so thoroughly contradicted by such expert testimony as Steele and Parks, Vaughan introduces a number of straw man innuendos, attributing to us (overtly or by implication) positions that we never held. For example, "In 1625, there was no earthly reason to append anything to *TR* that was not already there, and certainly no purpose in changing the document's date" (256). Who said that Purchas changed the document's date? On the contrary, we stated that Purchas probably had no reason to know the manuscript's detailed history; our hypothesis was not that Purchas changed the date, but that in the absence of more specific information, Purchas (or, possibly, Hakluyt) did what any other early modern editor would have done: he appended, as the manuscript's date, a date internal to the document. This editorial date is no more than a long-after-the-fact approximation, inserted to support the chronological coherence of the larger narrative (*Purchas His Pilgrimes*) of which Strachey's document as published constitutes merely a chapter.

[50] Vaughan, "Evidence," 267. Vaughan asserts that that the language of the transitional passage "evokes recent events...rather than over a decade of hindsight" (251). We disagree. "I have here inserted" does sound like a recent action, but the remainder of the statement has no such air of immediacy and instead seems to recall events not only past but completed (see analysis infra., 52-57).

[51] Vaughan, "Evidence," 266. Far from "peremptorily rejecting" Wright's theory, we argued, in extenso and for several reasons, that the transitional passage was most likely by Strachey, but we did not rule out Purchas, saying only that examination of that scenario would lead to other problems for *TR*'s textual integrity that were themselves uncongenial to the "standard thesis" (Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Voyagers," 457-458).

[52] Vaughan, "Evidence," 251. Vaughan persists in dating the *TR* manuscript to 15 July 1610, even though we pointed out that it is an error to treat a date from within the narrative as the work's composition date. This habit of selecting "facts" which don't actually pass the elementary fact test is further evidenced when he labors to prove that Sylvester Jourdain must have borrowed from Strachey, and not the other way around. To prove that Jourdain's *Discovery* antedates *TR*, Vaughan repeats the slip on which Luce had based his case for Strachey's influence in 1902 by giving the date of Jourdain's dedication (13 October 1610) while ignoring the document's actual history. *The latest entry of Jourdain's own publication deals with the events of June 19*, when Sir George Somers began his return to Bermuda to re-supply Jamestown. Ironically, Vaughan does not seem to notice that by his own implicit argument — that a document can and in fact should be dated by its last internal date — then Jourdain *predates TR by almost a month*. Only by mixing chronological apples and oranges (not to mention ignoring contradictory evidence) can Vaughan perpetuate the misconstruction that the chronology favors his theory that Jourdain borrowed from Strachey. Comparing one internal date with another, chronology clearly favors Strachey as the borrower; if, on the other hand, we employ publication or registration dates, Jourdain's text (13 Oct. 1610) predates Strachey's (1625) by fifteen years.

[53] Vaughan wants to have it both ways; he wants to preserve the fiction that the date is really a *terminus ad quem* but also insists that Strachey anticipated rather than recorded an event which had not yet taken place – the departure of Kainta to England.

[54] Tom Reedy observes that there are several excerpts and letters in Purchas that appear to be added by the author, using the word "inserted," and that in other cases of such insertions the genesis is indeterminate. Authors inserting material themselves, according to Reedy, include Captain John Saris (1.4.337.3) George Sandys

(2.8.1287.56-57), Marc Lescarbot or his translator (4.8.1621.21), and Edward Monoxe (2.10.1797.44), who writes: "The certaintie of the Treatie I had no meanes to know, yet what I heard reported shall be here inserted."

[55] Vaughan, "Evidence," 254.

[56] Vaughan, "Evidence," 255.

[57] Vaughan, "Evidence," 245.

[58] Wright, *TR*, 95-97.

[59] Vaughan cites the introduction of *TD* to illustrate his point about "palliation," but as this passage is *not* excerpted in *TR*, and the actual excerpt from *TD* fails to provide the slightest assurance of palliative intent or function (except perhaps a rather bizarre and half-hearted attempt to deny the existence of famine in the Colony by retelling an account of a man who killed and cut up his wife and ate her, but did so even though there was plenty of available food), this argument seems at best dubious. If the purpose was to use *TD* to palliate, why weren't the "palliatives" applied?

[60] Vaughan, "Evidence," 256

[61] Vaughan, "Evidence," 255.

[62] As the *TD* excerpt summarizes the circumstances: "Cast up this reckoning together: want of government, store of idleness, their expectations frustrated by the Traitors, their market spoiled by the Mariners, our nets broken, the deer chased, our boats lost, our hogs killed, our trade with the Indians forbidden, some of our men fled, some murdered, and most by drinking the brackish water of James fort weakened, and endangered famine and sickness by all these means increased, here at home the monies came in so slowly, that the Lo. Laware could not be dispatched, till the Colony was worn and spent with difficulties: Above all, having neither Ruler, nor Preacher, they neither feared God nor man, which provoked the wrath of the Lord of Hosts, and pulled down his judgements upon them. *Discite Justitiam moniti*" (Wright 99-100).

[63] The *TD* writer is quick to state that there was food in the house, to make sure that readers understand the husband didn't eat his wife because the colonists were starving.

[64] Vaughan, "Evidence," 257.

[65] Vaughan, "Evidence," 255

[66] Vaughan "Evidence," 256.

[67] Wright, *TR*: "When all things were made ready, and commodiously fitted, the wind coming fair, we set sail and put off from the Barmudas, the tenth day of May, in the year 1610, and arrived at James towne in Virginia, the four and twentieth day of the same Month: where we found some threescore persons living. And being then some three weeks or thereabouts passed, and not hearing of any supply, it was thought fitting by a general consent to use the best means for the preservation of all those people

that were living, being all in number two hundred persons [including those arriving from Bermuda]. And so upon the eight of June 1610, we imbarked at James Towne, not having above fourteen days victual, and so were determined to direct our course for New-found-land, there to refresh us, and supply our selves with victual, to bring us home; but it pleased God to dispose otherwise of us, and to give us better means. For being all of us shipped in four pinnaces, and departed from the town, almost down half the River, we met my Lord de la Warre coming by with three ships, well furnished with victual, which revived all the company, and gave them great content" (114-115).

[68] Another paradox of Vaughan's argument results from his assurance that Virginia Company authorities frowned at Strachey's document because of its extravagantly rosy description of Bermuda; Jourdain's published "praise of Bermuda [in *Discovery*] was less fulsome than Strachey's...." (Vaughan, "Evidence," 256). But Vaughan does not mention that King James in 1612 extended a Somers Island patent to the Virginia Company; in 1615 these former Virginia Company shareholders were licensed to form their own separate Somers Island Company (Craven, Wesley Frank. 1997. *The Virginia Company of London, 1606-1624.* Jamestown 350th Anniversary Historical Booklet #5. Baltimore Md: Genealogical Pub. Co., 34). Thus, for some years after Gates' 1610 return to England, company insiders would have had little reason to deprecate a document that reported favorably on the potential for Bermuda settlement. The actual content of Jourdain's *Discovery* further undermines the claim that Strachey's overly optimistic account of Bermuda could have prevented its publication; Jourdain's treatment of the idylls of Bermuda, although not as developed as Strachey's, reads like a Jacobean version of a modern travel industry brochure:

For the Islands of the Barmudas, as every man knows that has heard or read of them, were never inhabited by any Christian or Heathen people, but ever esteemed, and reputed, a most prodigious and enchanted place....yet did we find there the air so temperate, and the Country so abundantly fruitful of all fit necessaries for the sustentation and preservation of mans life...out of the abundance thereof, provided some reasonable quantitie and proportion of provision, to carry us for Virginia, and to maintain our selves, and that company we found there, to the great relief of them, as it fell out in their so great extremities, and in respect of the shortness of time, until it pleased God, that by my Lord de la Wars coming thither, their store was better was better supplied. And greater; & better provision we might have made, if we had had better means for the storing and transportation thereof. Wherefore my opinion sincerely of this Island is, that whereas it has been, and is still accounted, the most dangerous,

unfortunate, and most forlorn place of the world, it is in truth the richest, healthfullest, and pleasing land, (the quantity and bigness thereof considered) and merely natural, as ever man set foot upon. (Wright 109).

Jourdain's narrative goes on to advertise the fecundity of the Bermuda landscape, where colonists may easily find rockfish, mullets, large birds and tortoises, and their eggs, mulberries, Palmetto tree berries, whales, "divers" fruits, hogs, hawks, tobacco, etc. Explicitly contradicting Vaughan's thesis that the Virginia Company wanted to avoid public praise of the islands (and that Jourdain's publication was authorized by them), he even remarks that "the particular profits and benefits whereof, shall be more especially inserted, and hereunto annexed, which every man to his own private knowledge, that was there, can avouch and justify for a truth" (Wright 109).

[69] Malone, *Incidents*, 22.

[70] Vaughan, "Evidence," 269.

[71] Unfortunately, Vaughan's survey of the critical literature substantiating the extent of Strachey's "borrowings" is thin and unrepresentative. See, for example, Culliford, S.G., *William Strachey, 1572-1621* (Charlottesville, VA, 1965): "The 6th chapter of Strachey's 2nd book [of *History of travail*], describing the voyage of captain Bartholomew Gosnold in 1602 is condensed directly from [John Brereton] and has no other source" (177); "The 2nd chapter describing the voyage of captains Amadis and Barlowe, is taken entirely from Hakluyt, rearranged and condensed....the whole chapter can be paralleled....from Hakluyt" (176); "A condensation of James Rosier['s] work occupies about half of Strachey's 7th chapter in book 2" (177); "Strachey borrowed about four fifths of Smith's [*Map*] and included every passage actually describing the people, the country, or its products" (178); "Smith's *Map of Virginia* provided the basis of the whole of Strachey's 1st book" (179). "[Strachey] reproduces [James Davies'] account almost in full, merely changing it from the 1st to the 3rd person" (182-183).

[72] Unfortunately, even these critics of Strachey's practices have routinely failed to give equal attention to TR, which has instead been largely exempted from scrutiny due to the pervasive influence of, and need to perpetuate, the "standard thesis."

[73] Vaughan, "Evidence," 269, fn. 62.

[74] Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Voyagers," 454-456. We cite Rev. B.F. Da Costa's study, "Norumbega and its English Explorers," (1884), in J. Winsor (ed.), *Narrative and Critical History of America*. Vol. 3. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., online at the Davistown Museum. According to Da Costa, the journal of Mr. James Davies, recounting a voyage to Kennebec in 1607, "was found to be the source whence Strachey drew his account of the [Virginia] colony, large portions of which he copied verbatim, giving no credit." Numerous similar quotations throughout the literature

of the voyagers, almost none acknowledged by Vaughan, corroborate the view that Strachey was among the least original of all the early modern ethno-historians.

[75] Major, R.H., ed. *The Historie of travaile into Virginia Britannia expressing the cosmographie and comodities of the country, together with the manners and customes of the people. By William Strachey.* London: Printed for the Hackluyt Society, 1849.

[76] Vaughan, "Evidence," 269.

[77] Vaughan, "Evidence," 268; emphasis added.

[78] Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Voyagers," 453-459.

[79] Vaughan, "Evidence," 268.

[80] As we noted (453), this cannot be his subsequent *H of T*, which does not mention Bermuda.

[81] *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia. Published by advise and direction of the Councell of Virginia.* London: William Barret, 1610. On-line edition accessed at Virtual Jamestown, http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin /jamestown, Accessed 2/28/09.

[82] They were so secret in fact, that for the most part we do not know who wrote them or what they wrote.

[83] We have interpreted "The Judicial Council of Virginia" to be de La Warre's newly constituted Council in Virginia, rather than the Company Council still in London, because only the members of the Council in Virginia would have the information necessary for fashioning TD.

[84] See Wright 85-86 for a complete list. Strachey, as secretary to the colony council, is on it, one of many.

[85] As the Colony's secretary and one of five signatories to this document, Strachey may well have been part author of this document, but it appears to be in the first person voice of De La Warre, and it narrates experiences such as De La Warre's voyage to Virginia, to which Strachey was not a witness.

[86] For example, this passage from Strachey describing events that took place months before his arrival in Jamestown: Even more curiously, both Strachey and the author of *TD* have interwoven the passage about Captain Francis West at the Falls, which seems likely to have originated with Percy, with descriptive materials from Richard Eden's 1555 *Decades of the Newe Worlde*. That the author of *TD* mentions in passing places referred to in Eden suggests that he was directly influenced by the earlier writer rather than by Strachey.

Eden 1555	*True Declaration* 1610	*True Reportory* 1625
For in many regions…they find wholesome and temperate air, in such places where as the earth bringeth forth fair springs of water, or where wholesome rivers run by banks of pure earth without mud: but most especially where they inhabit the sides of the hills and not the valleys. But that the habitation which is on the banks of the river of *Dariena* is situate in a deep valley and environed on every side with high hills…Their habitation therefore in *Dariena* is pernicious and unwholesome only of the particular nature of the place… The place is also contagious by the nature of the soil, by reason it is compassed about with muddy and stinking marshes. The infection whereof is not a little increased by the heat. The village itself is in a marsh, and in manner a standing puddle…furthermore, where to ever they dig the ground the depth of a handful and a half there springeth out unwholesome and corrupt water of the nature of the river…Now therefore they consult on moving their habitation….They had no respect to change the place although they were thus vexed by the contagion of the soil and heat of the sun, beside the corrupt water and infectious air by reason of venomous vapors…(121v-122) from the trees and herbs whereof, when the morning dews began to rise, there proceeded many sweet savours (29).	No man ought to judge of any country by the fens and marshes (such as is the place where Jamestown stands) except we will condemn all England for the wilds and hundreds of Kent and Essex. **In our particular, we have an infallible proof of the temper of the country, for of an hundred and odd which were seated at the Falls under the government of Captain Francis West, and of an hundred to the seaward on the south side of the river, (in the country of Nansemonds) under the charge of Captain John Martin, of all these two hundred there did not so much as one man miscarry. When in Jamestown at the same time and in the same months, one hundred sickened, and half the number died.** The like experiment was long since in the regiment of Sir Ralph Lane, where, in the space of one whole year, not two of one hundred perished. Add unto this the discourse of philosophie; when in that Country flesh will receive salt, and continue unputrified (which it will not in the *West Indies*) when the most delicate of all flowers, grow there as familiarly, as in the fields of *Portuga*l, where the woods are replenished with more sweet barks, and odors, then they are in the pleasantest places of *Florida*. How is it possible that such a virgin and temperate air, should work such contrarie effects, but because our fort (that lyeth as a semi-island) is most part environed with an ebbing and flowing of salt water, the ooze of which sendeth forth an unwholesome & contagious vapour?	True it is, I may not excuse this our fort, or Jamestown, as yet seated in somewhat an unwholesome and sickly air, by reason it is in a marish ground, low, flat to the river, and hath no fresh-water springs serving the town but what we drew from a well six or seven fathom deep fed by the brackish river oozing into it; from whence I verily believe the chief causes have proceeded of many diseases and sicknesses which have happened to our people, who are indeed strangely afflicted with fluxes and agues, and every particular season (by the relation of the old inhabitants) hath his particular infirmity too: all which, if it had been our fortunes to have seated upon some hill, accommodated with fresh springs and clear air, as do the natives of the country, we might have, I believe, well escaped. **And some experience we have to persuade ourselves that it may be so, for of four hundred and odd men which were seated at the Falls the last year when the fleet came in with fresh and young able spirits under the government of Captain Francis West, and of one hundred to the seawards (on the south side of our river), in the country of the Nansemonds under the charge of Captain John Martin, there did not so much as one man miscarry, and but very few, or none, fall sick. Whereas at Jamestown, the same time and the same months, one hundred sickened, and half the number died.** Howbeit, as we condemn not Kent in England for a small town called Plumstead, continually assaulting the dwellers there (especially newcomers) with agues and fevers, no more let us lay scandal and imputation upon the country of Virginia because the little quarter wherein we are set down (unadvisedly so choosed) appears to be unwholesome and subject to many ill airs which accompany the like marish places. (Wright 82-83)

Table One: Comparison of Eden, *True Declaration*, and *True Reportory* demonstrating TR incorporated material from both Eden and TD.

87

Percy	*True Reportory*
While we remained at this Island *we saw a Whale chased by a Thresher and a Swordfish*: they fought for the space of two hours, we might see the *Thresher with his flayle lay on the monstrous blows* which was strange to behold: in the end these two fishes brought the Whale to her end.	I forbear to speak ***what a sort of whales we have*** seen hard aboard the shore, *followed sometime by the swordfish and the thresher*, the sport whereof was not unpleasant, the swordfish with his sharp and needle fin pricking him into the belly, when he would sink and fall into the sea; and when he startled upward from his wounds, *the thresher with his large fins (like flails) beating him* above water…(29)
There the Captain landed all his men being well fitted with Muskets and other convenient Arms, marched a mile into the Woods; being *commanded to stand upon their guard*, fearing the treachery of the Indians.	but good watch passed upon them, every man from thenceforth *commanded to wear his weapon*, without which before we freely walked from quarter to quarter and conversed among ourselves, and every man advised to *stand upon his guard*, his own life not being in safety whilst his next neighbor was not to be trusted. (47)

Table Two: ***True Reportory*** borrowings from Percy.

Percy= *Observations gathered out of a Discourse of the Plantation of the Southerne Colonie in Virginia by the English*, 1606. Written by that Honorable Gentleman, Master George Percy. Accessed online, http://jefferson.village.virginia.edu/vcdh/jamestown, February 23, 2009.

88 The Spanish ambassador to the Court (1610-1513), Alonso De Velasco, reported to Philip III, the King of Spain, that Newport had "secretly reported the misery suffered by those who remain there [Virginia] and said that if Lord de la Warca [Warre] who recently went there as Governor, had delayed three days longer, the island would have been abandoned by the 300 persons who had remained alive out of 700, who had been sent out. In order to encourage the merchants, at whose expense this expedition is undertaken, so that they may persevere in it, he has publicly given out great hopes, and thus they have formed several Companies by which men will be sent out in assistance, and they have determined, that at the end of January of the coming year, three ships shall sail, with men, women and ministers of their religion…

if Y. M. [Your Majesty] were pleased to command that a few ships should be sent to that part of the world, which would drive out the few people that have remained there, and are so threatened by the Indians that they dare not leave the fort they have erected…." From a translated copy of Velasco's letter to Philip III, September 1610. Brown, Alexander, *The Genesis of the United States. A narrative of the movement in England, 1605–1616, which resulted in the plantation of North America by Englishmen, disclosing the contest between England and Spain for the possession of the soil now occupied by the United States of America*. 2 vols. New York: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1964 (reprint of 1890 Russell & Russell edition), I: 418–9.

[89] Vaughan, "Evidence," 267.

[90] That Strachey would do so, fusing parts of the De La Warre dispatch with his own words, is no surprise, even though Martin would have seen these words before. This appears to have been Strachey's *modus operandi*. He dedicated copies of *H of T*, for the most part a conflation of the published texts of others, to the Earl of Northumberland, who had "considerable interest in the voyages of colonization and exploration" (Culliford, *William Strachey*, 130-131) to Sir Allen Apsley, a nephew by marriage of Sir George Carew and member of the Council (Culliford, 131), and to Sir Francis Bacon, the Lord High Chancellor of England and member of the Virginia Company, who would have read most, if not all, of these texts in the original (See Culliford 165-184 for a comprehensive list of the sources Strachey used, very often verbatim, to write *H of T*).

[91] Strachey's habit of copying or collecting manuscripts and letters for future use is evident in the copious use he made of them for sources in composing his own work. He must have kept a copy of the B draft on which *TR* is based. He must have kept a copy (or notes) of the De La Warre dispatch to copy from for *TR* (or notes from which he drew both the segments in DLW and those in *TR*). Since *H of T* includes verbatim elements from Davies manuscript "Relation of a Voyage" (See Culliford, *William Strachey*, 182-183), he must also have kept a copy of it; likewise the Percy manuscript *Discourse of the Plantation* is used in both *TR* and *H of T* (Culliford 181-182). All of these items would likely have been gathered or copied while he was in Virginia. In fact, Strachey himself says in his dedication to the Earl of Northumberland that he keeps records, as he has made "the first Catograph or Draught, as [he has] had time to digest out of [his] journal or diary books" (*H of T*, ed Wright, 3, quoted in Culliford 130).

[92] Vaughan concludes a string of misrepresentations of our case for the *TR*'s dependence on the Martin letter by stating that it is "on such speculations that Stritmatter and Kositsky conclude that "at the very least, Martin's nescience disproves the frequent assertion that the Strachey letter circulated widely in the court or Company during the winter of 1610-11" (267). He reaches this conclusion partly by way of his own

scenario, attributed to us, that "the secretary of the Colony's report to the secretary of the Company was conveyed in a letter to an anonymous lady that dwells for three-quarters of its length on the Bermuda shipwreck and subsequent events about which Martin had not inquired" (267).

But it is Vaughan's assertion, not ours, that "the court in which the manuscript circulated was not that of James I but the council of the Virginia company of London" (261). How this proposition squares with the document's address to a "noble lady" whether real or imagined, Vaughan does not say. Vaughan seems to misunderstand our clearly articulated position – that *TR* is a palimpsest written over multiple other documents, including classical materials, earlier Iberian narratives, "storm set" descriptions, and significant parts of the De La Warre letter, the official dispatch to the company. But the simplest explanation of the known facts – including the existence of Hume's B manuscript (see our analysis infra, 37-42) – is that a copy of whatever went back to Martin, in response to his questions, has been inserted into what is now known as *TR*. There is no basis in our original article for the scenario that Vaughan attributes to us.

[93] Ivor Noël Hume, "William Strachey's Unrecorded First Draft of His Sea Venture Saga," *Avalon Chronicles*, VI (2001), 57-88. Hereafter, following the convention established by Hume, we refer to this transcript as "B."

[94] Hume, "First Draft," 57.

[95] Since that time the implications of this discovery for nearly a century of Strachey orthodoxy have been quietly ignored.

[96] Vaughan, "Evidence," 257.

[97] Vaughan, "Evidence," 257.

[98] Citing Hume (57-68) as his authority, Vaughan states that "internal evidence is overwhelming that the author in each case is Strachey" (258). The curious reader will be disappointed to learn that the implication that Hume presents "overwhelming… internal evidence" substantiating Strachey's authorship of both B and *TR* is erroneous. Indeed, Hume's eleven-page introduction to B *assumes* from start to finish that Strachey is the author of both texts and makes almost no effort to justify this assumption, instead merely asserting that "there is…ample evidence, both semantically and historically (sic), that Strachey wrote both accounts" (63). But the "evidence" to which both Hume and Vaughan unconsciously revert is the mere *assumption* that because *TR* is manifestly based on B, and because *TR* is attributed to Strachey, we are therefore obliged to conclude that Strachey is also the author of B. Consistent application of this reasoning would also oblige us to conclude that "there is ample evidence, both semantic and historical" that Strachey wrote Smith's *Map* and James Davies' "The Relation of a Voyage into New England," both of which

accounts Strachey reproduced verbatim, or nearly so, for pages and pages, in *H of T*. The discovery of the extent of Strachey's plagiaristic habits has been a historical process, suggesting that further revelations may not be improbable: Davies' account (Culliford, *William Strachey*, 182-83), like the B manuscript, lay undiscovered for many years.

On the other hand, both Hume and Vaughan, as they assume Strachey's authorship of both texts, fail to notice the one salient piece of internal evidence that does seem to link Strachey to both versions of the narrative, namely the author's reference to his experience in the Levant and Algeria. As it is known that Strachey had traveled to the Levant, this does constitute at least one solid piece of evidence supporting Strachey's authorship. It's possible, though, that many others on the *Sea Venture* had also visited the Levant and Algeria, and Newport had made the voyage through the Mediterranean at least once, in 1595, on the Golden Dragon. K.R. Andrews, "Christopher Newport of Limehouse, Mariner," *The William and Mary Quarterly*, 11:1. (1954) 34. We therefore conclude that it is impossible at present to rule out the possibility that the real author of B might be someone other than Strachey.

Despite the assurances of Hume and Vaughan to the contrary, there is therefore a serious basis to the problem of whether the author of B is also the reviser of *TR*. Both point of view and style of the earlier document are markedly different from *TR*; whereas Strachey's style is ornate and tends towards much longer and more complex sentences, B is straightforward and workmanlike, even staccato in its prose rhythms. Strachey's linguistic quirks, such as his habit of repeating "True it is" (at least eight times in *TR*) are also absent from B. Intriguingly, Vaughan acknowledges that the document also displays a "marked tendency to show William Strachey in a less flattering light than in the published version" (257). This tendency includes a pronoun shift between B and *TR*, one that indicates a marked alteration of narrative perspective on certain critical events, shifting from third to first person (see tables).

B's Plain Style (Hume, op. cit.	*TR*'s Decorative Style (Wright, *TR*)
The culprit earnestly requested that he might be shot as he was a gentleman, which request being granted he was put to death at sun set. (16. 18-20)	He earnestly desired, being a gentleman, that he might be shot to death, and toward the evening he had his desire, the sun and his life setting together. (49)
This is a small fortification built by our people last year and called Fort Algernon by Captain Percy. On the same day of our arrival there was a dreadful storm of thunder lightning and rain. (19. 30-33)	Our men did the last year (as you have heard) raise a little fortification, which since hath been better perfected and is likely to prove a strong fort, and is now kept by Captain James Davies with forty men, and hath to name Algernon Fort, so called by Captain George Percy, whom we found at our arrival president of the colony and at this time likewise in the fort. When we got into the Point, which was the one-and-twentieth of May, being Monday about noon; where riding before an Indian town called Kecoughtan, a mighty storm of thunder, lightning and rain gave us a shrewd and fearful welcome. (62-63)

Table Three: Plain style of B contrasted to decorative style of *TR*.

B	*TR*
The wave struck him from his seat, and three other persons, the whole who were around him, down on their faces. (4.20-22)	It struck him from the place where he sat and groveled him and all us about him on our faces. (11)
The higher order of our company... repaired to the governor and besought him to pardon him the culprit, which after much entreaty he consented to. (14. 28-30)	The better sort of the Company...went unto our governor, whom they besought (as likewise did Captaine Newport and my selfe), and never left him until we had got his pardon. (45)

Table Four: B's point of view contrasted to *TR*'s point of view.

While it is certainly possible that such differences are the result of a single author revising and refashioning his own work in a more leisured context, possibly with a different audience in mind, it must be admitted that they also suggest a scenario in which the author and the reviser are not the same individual. If so, the document's history would be consistent with Strachey's demonstrated habits of appropriating and rewriting the narratives of other voyagers (see Da Costa, fn.74 above).

[99] The available evidence does not support Vaughan's assumption that the books in question would have been available in Jamestown. See William S. Powell, "Books in the Virginia Colony before 1624." *William and Mary Quarterly* 3:5 (1948), 177-84.

[100] Vaughan, "Evidence," 258.

[101] Vaughan, "Evidence," 273.

[102] Stritmatter and Kositsky, 452, fn 10. It does not seem likely that *TR* could be constructed in a month, as Vaughan suggests, especially as Strachey was the secretary and recorder of the Colony, and also would have had many duties in that capacity. Moreover, we argued that conditions in the Colony between the time of the Bermuda survivors' arrival in May and the sighting of De La Warre in early June were inimical to the completion of such a sophisticated literary document. After de La Warre's arrival conditions gradually improved.

[103] In addition, the fact that B does not include any elements from the De La Warre dispatch argues for it being a copy of the original Strachey communiqué to England. Why would Strachey duplicate verbatim large sections of an official dispatch going back on the same voyage in his unofficial "letter" to the lady, which Vaughan insists must have been seen and read by the Company?

[104] In fact, so much is missing in B that, although it is of the same approximate length as De La Warre's dispatch and Jourdain's *Discovery*, it would make a poor *Tempest* source indeed – on this point we agree with Vaughan (259) – since many of the so-called "parallels" are attenuated or altogether absent.

[105] Does the fact that B, unlike TR, has no identifiable addressee resolve the longstanding enigma about whether Strachey's text was written as an address to the Company or to a noble lady? It seems plausible that a copy of the B version, whether written for the Company or for a more private purpose in Virginia, was later amended in England, first by Strachey and then again by Purchas (and/or Hakluyt) to assume the form eventually published by Purchas in 1625.

[106] Strachey, William. *For The colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes divine, morall and martiall, &c.* London: J. Stansby for Walter Burre, 1612. Accessed at *Virtual Jamestown*. Accessed at Virtual Jamestown,http://extext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown, 5.

[107] Vaughan opines that "the shorter letter....was intended....for a relative or a friend when Strachey's fate, and everyone else's on Bermuda, was still uncertain" (258). It appears that Vaughan may not have read the B text with any care, as he not only confuses the document's genre but gives a mistaken account of its contents. Not only is there

no evidence for its origin as a "letter" (as distinct from a report or diary entry), but it was not written "when Strachey's fate, and everyone else's in Bermuda, was still uncertain." In fact, B does make reference to events in Virginia after it was clear that the survival of marooned Bermuda sailors was assured; the author of the B manuscript was among those who traveled from Bermuda to Virginia to discover that "the Colony was in a distressed condition, the buildings going to waste, & the scarcity of provisions daily increasing...Indiscretion in the management, added to the conduct of the colonists, produced those evils to which may be added the jealousy of the natives & the unexpected failure that was expected to be easily obtained" (19-20; 84-85 Hume). In fact, the B manuscript, as Vaughan acknowledges a few lines later, continues its narrative up until at least the June 10 arrival of Lord de La Warre from England to the Virginia Colony. Vaughan's internally inconsistent scenario regularly fails to take notice of such moments of conspicuous contradiction.

[108] How conclusive are these considerations? In order to believe, as the "standard thesis" must, that Strachey is in *Lawes* referring to something other than an unpublished and uncompleted version of *TR*, one must accept one, or a combination, of the following corollaries:

1. *H of T* does not mention Bermuda, but it is the work to which Strachey alludes; or

2. *H of T* – unlike *TR* – is not the account of a "sufferer and eye witness," but a more formal "History," yet it is the work to which Strachey alludes; or

3. The manuscript to which Strachey alludes, both in its current and "perfected" forms is no longer extant; or

4. Strachey had already completed his "eyewitness" account of the Bermuda shipwreck and sent it to a Noble Lady on Gates 1610 voyage, but he was considering another work fitting the same description.

[109] Wright, 94.

[110] Vaughan, "Evidence," 263.

[111] Vaughan, "Evidence," 263, our emphasis.

[112] Raleigh, *Discovery Of Guiana*, Part III, 1595: "Those canoas that were taken were loaded with bread, and *were bound for* Margarita in the West Indies, which those Indians, called Arwacas, proposed to carry thither for exchange...." Hakluyt: It fell out that the Toby, which *was bound for* Constantinople, had made such good speed, and gotten such good weather, that she first of all the rest came back to the appointed place of Zante, and not forgetting the former conclusion, did there cast anchor, attending the arrival of the rest of the fleet (Voyagers' tales from the collections of Richard Hakluyt ([1900]). Accessed http://www.archive.org/details/voyagerstalesfro00hakiala, 2/38/09.

Even Shakespeare, in *Tempest*, uses the word in a way that evidently contradicts Vaughan's creative interpretation:

And for the rest o' th' fleet
(Which I dispers'd), they have all met again,
And are upon the Mediterranean float
Bound sadly home for Naples…
(1.2.232-37)

[113] After selectively presenting 2a ("In the time directly following the present; immediately, forthwith"), and ignoring the contrary definitions that contradict his theory, Vaughan claims that "Strachey *clearly means that* the ships will sail 'forthwith'" (263 fn 48; our emphasis).

[114] The others are "1. a) At the present time or moment; b) in extended use; under the present circumstances; in view of what has happened…3. In the time directly preceding the present moment." *The Compact Edition of the Oxford English Dictionary: Complete Text Reproduced Micrographically*. Oxford: The University Press, 1971, 1951.

[115] Wright, *TR*, 94, our emphasis.

[116] As several examples from the *KJV* illustrate: John 5.37: And the Father himself, which *hath sent me*, hath borne witness of me; I Kings 1.44: And the king *hath sent with* him Zadok the priest, and Nathan the prophet; John 5.23: He that honoureth not the Son honoureth not the Father *which hath sent* him.

[117] Wright, *TR*, 89.

[118] Vaughan, "Evidence," 263.

[119] Travel times are given in the following two sources: *The Voyage of Captaine Samuell Argall, From Jamestown in Virginia to Seek the Isle of Bermuda…Begun the 19th of June 1610* reports that "Sir George Somers…set sail from Jamestown in Virginia the19th of June, 1610. The two and twentieth at noon we came to an anchor at Cape Henry [somewhat further than Point Comfort] to take more ballast" (PP, 4:1758). A comparable estimate is from *TR*: "When we got into [Point Comfort], which was the one-and-twentieth of May, being Monday about noon; where riding before an Indian town called Kecoughtan, a mighty storm of thunder, lightning and rain gave us a shrewd and fearful welcome. From hence in two days (only by the help of tides, no wind stirring), we plied it sadly up the river, and the three-and-twentieth of May we cast anchor before Jamestown" (Wright 63).

[120] Vaughan's scenario placing Strachey in Jamestown while Gates and De La Warre were downriver at Point Comfort on July 15 strains credibility. How, for example, could Strachey from Jamestown have known when the ships, which in Vaughan's scenario were waiting for ideal conditions, actually departed? Moreover, such empirical evidence as we have suggests that Strachey was with either Gates or De La Warre. In *TR*, Strachey places himself four miles from Algernon Fort, near to the mouth of the James River and Point Comfort (perhaps two days by boat from Jamestown) on July 9 (Wright 89). As the Colony's Secretary, moreover, he would undoubtedly have been with De La Warre at Point Comfort at the critical period of the sailing of the ships.

[121] Vaughan, "Evidence," 265.

[122] Vaughan, "Evidence," 266.

[123] Vaughan, "Evidence," 265; our emphasis.

[124] Vaughan, Alden. *Transatlantic Encounters American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776*. Cambridge: The University Press, 2006, 51.

[125] Vaughan, *Encounters*, 51.

[126] Major, R.H. *The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia; Expressing the Cosmography and Commodities of the Countrey, Togither with the Manners and Customs of the People. Gathered and Observed as Well by those who went First Thither as Collected by William Strachey, Gent., The First Secretary of the Colony.* London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1849.

[127] Vaughan, "Evidence," 266.

[128] Tyler, Lyon Gardiner. *The Cradle of the Republic: Jamestown and James River*, Volume 1,Willow Bend, Westminster, Maryland, 2001, 12. Originally published 1900.

[129] Boddie, John Bennett. *Seventeenth Century Isle of Wight County, Virginia: A History of the County of Isle of Wight, Virginia, During the Seventeenth Century, Including Abstracts of the County Records*, Volume 1, Heritage Books, Westminster, Maryland, 1980, 2-3. Reprint of 1935 original. Although we find the material concerning Sasenticum and Kainta (Kaintu) intriguing, we have not yet found a primary source to confirm Tyler and Boddie's statements. But neither have we found a primary source that justifies Vaughan's unqualified assertion that Tackonekintaco and Sasenticum were the same person.

[130] According to the *Isle of Wight Historical Review's* entry on the Warraskoyak, Jamestown lay "twenty miles to the north-east" of the territory. http://web.ukonline.co.uk/lordcornell/iwhr/va/warra.htm.

[131] Wright, *TR*, 94.

[132] Vaughan, "Evidence," 263, 265.

[133] Vaughan, "Evidence," 269.

[134] In addition to De Zuniga and Smith, Francis Maguel, the Spanish envoy to Virginia, recorded the incident in a July 1610 to the Spanish Council of State:

The Emperor [Powhatan] sent one of his sons to England, where they treated him well and returned him once more to his own country, from which the said Emperor and his people derived great contentment thro' the account which he gave of the kind reception and treatment he received in England.

(Brown, op. cit., i:396)

[135] Smith, John. *The third Booke of the Proceedings and Accidents of The English Colony in Virginia, in The Complete Works of John Smith*, accessed at Virtual Jamestown,http://extext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown, 2/26/09.

[136] Major, *H of T*, 58.

[137] In his dedication of *H of T* to the Earl of Northumberland, Strachey actually states that he has borrowed material from Percy: "Your noble brother (from whose commentaries

and observations I must freely confess) I have collected these passages and knowledges) out of his his free and honourable love for me." *William Strachey, The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania (1612)*, ed. Louis B. Wright and Virginia Freund. London: Hakluyt Society, 1953.4. So it is not implausible to suggest that Percy is the originator of Strachey's *H of T* anecdote about the Indian boy who escaped from the DeLaWarr.

[138] *A Trewe Relacyon of the Procedeinges and Ocurrentes of Momente wch have hapned in Virginia from the Tyme Sr Thomas GATES was shippwrackte uppon the BERMUDES ano 1609 untill my depture outt of the Country wch was in ano Dñi 1612.* Accessed at *Virtual Jamestown*, http://extext.lib.virginia.edu/etcbin/jamestown, 2/28/09.

[139] Schumann, Howard. "Concordia Proposes Shakespeare Authorship Studies Center," *Shakespeare Matters* 5:3 (2006), 1, 26-31.

[140] Stritmatter and Kositsky, *Voyagers*, 451, fn 8.

[141] To Vaughan, Hakluyt's 1600 publication of May's 1593 account of a shipwreck in Bermuda, caused by drunken sailors, is "irrelevant" to assessing the credibility of the standard thesis. Vaughan attributes to critics of this thesis the view that Hakluyt's account "preempted everything Shakespeare might have gleaned from Strachey's narrative" (260). We know of no such claim by anyone, but notwithstanding this potential objection, Vaughan proceeds: "That explanation overlooks England's long-standing awareness of Bermuda's reputation, to which May's brief account of shipwreck as a result of the crew's negligence – no storm, many drowned, no conspiracies among the survivors – bears no resemblance to the *Tempest*" (260: sic). Grammatical quibbles aside, Vaughan seems unaware that there are actually conspiracies in the May account, as well as a mutiny and a storm, although much before the wreck. Henry May, "A Briefe Note of a Voyage to the *East Indies* . . . ," in *Hakluyt, Principal Navigations*, 3.571–74.

Even more tellingly, the statement that allusion to May's possible influence on Shakespeare "overlooks England's longstanding awareness of Bermuda's reputation" attributes to us the weaknesses of his own position. Actually, it is Vaughan's own "standard thesis" that "overlooks England's long-standing awareness of Bermuda's reputation" as a fearful "isle of devils" by insisting that Shakespeare must have relied on Strachey or other accounts of the Gates shipwreck. This tendency to exclude from consideration earlier voyager accounts, including those that make reference to Bermuda, is clear in the scholarship. May's 1593 shipwreck narrative is merely one instance illustrating that, contrary to the widely and erroneously propagated (well into the 20th century) belief of Malone, namely that the Bermuda islands "were not generally known till Sir George Somers arrived there in 1609" (in Furness 74), Bermuda was a familiar locale in England long before the 1609 Gates' misadventure.

[142] Vaughan, "Evidence," 269.

[143] Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Voyagers," 454.

[144] Among other problems, Vaughan seems to have ignored the fact that our bibliography clearly shows that our text is the one edited by Major, to which Strachey made emendations in around 1617 to account for the death of Prince Henry.

[145] Culliford, *William Strachey*, 188 our emphasis.

[146] Vaughan, "Evidence," 256; our emphasis.

[147] Vaughan, "Evidence," 273; our emphasis.

[148] Vaughan, "Evidence," 254.

[149] Vaughan, "Evidence," 268; our emphasis. Variations on the phrase "almost certain(ly)" constitute one of Vaughan's favorite expressions, readily employed as a substitute for actual evidence, to bolster a critical point in a scenario that is wholly lacking in independent verification. This seems to serve the significant rhetorical purpose of anchoring the author's conclusions in a forceful attestation of belief designed to overcome any objection based on reasoning. Indeed, a reader soon learns that the "facts" which underwrite validity of Vaughan's narrative are typically either erroneous, incapable of demonstration, or without authority. According to Vaughan, "*TR* [in manuscript form] must have been widely read, often aloud" (271), and that "we can only surmise about the form in which Shakespeare encountered it" (271). But of course the statement that *TR* was widely circulated, let alone "often read aloud," or read at all, or even that it was completed in time to play its starring role in Vaughan's creative scenario, is no more than surmise, unsupported by a scintilla of reproducible evidence. Still less is there any real evidence that Shakespeare encountered it in any form.

The fact that no manuscript copy of *TR* survives in England does not inspire confidence in the theory for its widespread circulation outside of the immediate Strachey-Hakluyt circle. But there are other troubles with Vaughan's scenario as well. By Vaughan's own count (271), as many as eight versions of the Bermuda shipwreck eventually circulated in Jacobean England. With this context in mind, it is striking to note how little influence Strachey's own narrative seems to have exercised on derivative accounts, and how little it agrees in many essentials with other primary accounts of the Bermuda shipwreck. While Vaughan acknowledges that published works such as Jourdain's had manifest influence on such secondary accounts as Hughes 1615 *A Letter Sent into England*, none of the seven other accounts followed Strachey's idiosyncratic account of the storm, including his mention the seemingly highly "newsworthy" occurrence of St. Elmo's fire. Its influence on other works of the period is entirely hypothetical, and its influence specifically on The Tempest has been challenged far more widely and successfully than Vaughan admits.

[150] Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.

[151] Vaughan, "Evidence," 271.

[152] Hume, *First Draft*, 63, our emphasis. However, although Vaughan and Hume agree that Strachey's influence on Shakespeare may safely be regarded as beyond doubt, and

that both versions of the Strachey manuscript reached England by 1610, they disagree about which of these Shakespeare must have read. Indeed, Hume throws a monkey wrench into the traditional view of Shakespeare's dependence on the published version of *TR* by insisting that "there is equal likelihood" (61) that it was the B, rather than the Purchas text, that provided the bard with his inspiration. Vaughan disagrees, citing three reasons for adhering to the traditional view that *TR* must have been Shakespeare's source: 1) *TR*'s "brief reference to Dido"; 2) his "description of Governor Gates's gentle treatment of Indians in Virginia until he was 'startled' by the murder of a colonist" (259) — which Vaughan identifies "as a parallel, perhaps, to Prospero's handling of Caliban before he abused Miranda" (259); 3) the "close comparison of the *Tempest*'s storm with the two versions of Strachey's letter shows a higher frequency of" (259).

The disagreement illustrates the intrinsically subjective nature of the standards which have historically been employed for evaluating Tempest influence and have plagued the case for the influence of the Bermuda documents on Shakespeare since its earliest phases when Sylvester Jourdain and *TD* – not B or *TR* – was the supposed vector of influence. While we agree with Vaughan's negative verdict on the plausibility of B's influence, his arguments in favor of *TR* are unimpressive: the association between Aeneas and the New World was, of course, a commonplace (found, among other sources, in Eden); likewise, the conflicted relations between Native and Colonist are treated in numerous accounts from the period. And while it is true that the storm scene of *TR* is substantially enlarged over that found in B, we disagree that this account contains anything uniquely suggestive of the *Tempest* storm, many critical elements of which (including many of those identified by Kathman and others as necessarily due to Strachey's influence) are already seen in Shakespeare's wholly metaphorical storm in 3 *Henry VI* (5.4.1-60) and many other earlier sources, as we have shown in their online table (see appendix A).

[153] Cawley, R.R. "Shakespeare's Use of the Voyagers in *The Tempest*," *PMLA* XLI (1926), 688-726.

[154] Kathman, David. "Dating *The Tempest*." n.d. *The Shakespeare Authorship Page, http://shakespeareauthorship.com/tempest/html,* accessed May 24, 2005.

[155] While Vaughan accepts at face value the inflated conclusions of Luce, Cawley and Kathman, and "generally agrees" that the "verbal parallels between the Bermuda pamphlets and *Tempest*" are real and compelling evidence for intertextuality, he also places special emphasis on the claim that "the importance of....thematic parallels" and more generally even "the impact on English public opinion of the events of 1609-10," which he accuses us of "overlooking or outright denying" (271).

[156] Which Vaughan does not acknowledge.

[157] Kositsky, Lynne and Roger Stritmatter, "Dating *The Tempest*: A Note on the Undocumented Influence of Erasmus' "Naufragium" and Richard Eden's 1555 *Decades of the*

New World." First published 6/25/05. http://www.shakespearefellowship.org/virtualclassroom/Tempest Table.htm, accessed 2/7/09.

[158] Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.

[159] Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.

[160] Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.

[161] Cawley, "Voyagers" 695-96, fn 23. It is evident that Cawley has not closely compared Eden's text with Shakespeare's imaginative conception of the phenomenon, or he would have seen the evident connection between the two texts.

[162] Eden, Richard. *The Decades of the Newe Worlde or West India by Pietro Martire d' Anghiera* (f.p. 1555). Readex Microprint. 1966.

[163] For our more detailed analysis, see Stritmatter and Kositsky, "O Brave New World": *The Tempest* and Peter Martyr's *De Orbe Novo*," *Critical Survey* 21:2 (fall 2009), 7-42.

[164] Eden, 217V. Our emphasis.

[165] Thus Ariel, describing the storm's St. Elmo's Fire, exemplifies Pygafetta's account when he personifies himself as the phenomenon:

I flam'd amazement. Sometimes *I'ld* divide,
And burn in many places; on the topmast,
The yards and boresprit, would *I* flame distinctly
(1.1.196-200; emphasis added).

[166] Vaughan, "Evidence," 273.

[167] Vaughan, "Evidence," 273.

[168] A pinnace, which the *Sea Venture* had been towing before the storm, was also lost at sea or "taken at some time or other at some advantage by the savages and so cut off." (Wright, *TR*, 4, 62).

[169] Vaughan, "Evidence," 273.

[170] Stritmatter and Kositsky, "Brave New World."

[171] Marshall, Tristan. "*The Tempest* and the British Imperium in 1611," The Historical Journal, 41:2 (Jun. 1998), 375-400.383.

[172] Shakespeare might also have read about the internecine quarrels of the Sforza dynasty in Geoffrey Fenton's popular translation of Guiccardini's *Historia d' Italia* (1579, 1599, 1617). The topic became a popular subject in drama, with three plays based on Ludovico Sforza's life long before Massinger's 1623 *Duke of Millaine*.

[173] "Even if Caliban is a native of the island by birth, no true humans dwelled there – like Bermuda, it had abundant spirits – before Europeans arrive, piecemeal in the play but altogether in Strachey's narrative" (Vaughan, op. cit., 273).

[174] After more than two centuries of *Tempest* criticism emphasizing the play's new world associations, the critical pendulum has begun to swing in the opposite direction, with much recent scholarship instead emphasizing sources and symbolism that connect The Tempest more to the old world of Aeneas than to the new world of Christopher Columbus, suggesting that "the colonial reading of the play masks the Mediterranean

contexts which are much more obvious on the play's surface" (Lindley, David. *The Tempest. The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge: At the University Press, 2002, 45) and that colonial criticism has "flatten[ed] the text into the mould of colonialist discourse and eliminat[ed] what is characteristically 'Shakespearean' in order to foreground what is 'colonialist'" (Skura, Meredith Anne, "Discourse and the Individual: The Case of Colonialism in The Tempest," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 40:1 (Spring 1989), 47). Other recent examples of the Mediterraneanist trend in Tempest scholarship include Wilson-Okamura, David Scott, "Virgilian Models of Colonization in *Shakespeare's Tempest*," *ELH 70 (2003), 709-737;* Wylie, John, "New and Old Worlds: *The Tempest* and early colonial discourse," Social & Cultural Geography, 1:1 (2000), 45-63, and especially Peter Hulme and William H. Sherman, Editors, *"The Tempest" and Its Travels*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 2000.

[175] Gayley, op. cit., 65. Cited approvingly by Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.

[176] Hamilton, Donna B. *Virgil and the Tempest: The Politics of Imitation*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press: 1990.

[177] Hunter, *Disquisition*.

[178] Stritmatter, Roger and Lynne Kositsky. "Pale as Death: The Fictionalizing Influence of Erasmus's '*Naufragium'* On the Renaissance Travel Narrative," in *Essays in Honor of Isabel Holden* (Concordia University), fall 2008, 141-151.

[179] Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.

[180] Vaughan, "Evidence," 272.